

Dear? [One corner of letter torn, but quite likely sent to her cousins, Julia and Hester Fish in Carpinteria, California]

The jacket is lovely and just That wasn't a hard guess you know that we needed the animal cutters. We tried a year ago to get some in Seoul but they had only a rusty set of hearts. Then this year we were asked to furnish cookies for the community Christmas celebration - animals if possible - and there were our new cutters. Children do enjoy them so, but I think you were terribly clever to think of them. Now to return to the jacket. It fits Sammy now and by the time Howard can sit up in the early spring, he can wear it with a little bonnet which was sent him and has a similar stitching in colors. They are so convenient and so pretty; this one is a beauty and we shall be able to enjoy it for two solid years.

How are you all, I wonder, and what is the news from Frances? Are you knitting and sewing for the Red Cross? Our box of materials from the Yokohama Branch must have gone astray and we feel dreadfully "out of it" when all letters are full of what others are doing.

One thing you do we can vouch for - late production of food stuffs. Please tell Uncle Henry those beans will be given our most intelligent attention - and better yet, that of our friend, Deacon Châ, who serves as outdoor man. He gained us the prize for celery last year.

Mr. Cook who is to go to Manchuria next year to work among the Koreans there, has been taking a preliminary view of his field and stopped with us on his way back. He brings great tales of bandits. Mr. McKenzie, a good missionary of the Scotch Church was captured by a band of sixty, organized under five sub-chiefs. They gave back his money but took his watch and razor as valuables. They offered to return those too if he would become their leader and take them to France to fight. He preferred the "banner of the cross."

This is the star season of the year for station work, for the men have to stay at home to teach in the big men's class, which continues during the next six weeks. Men like Mr. Welbon, Mr. Phillips and Mr. Holdcroft are not in much at any other time. Sam, of course, has the Theological Seminary which keeps him several months longer. However, last time he went out to a country church he had to walk, for the weather was so deadly the ricksha men all refused to go the ten miles.

Next month the women's classes begin. Mrs. Swallen and Miss Best were planning the "practical talks" and so happy because all can be given now by Korean women. Hard work in the beginning does pay. The Koreans now can do many things better than we. Sam was also congratulating himself on the ease the foreign pastors can now take in presbytery. A Korean moderator and the Korean pastors do the work. They have just decided that no smoker is eligible for an elder and that one who begins to use tobacco after becoming an elder, shall be disciplined.

As to practical talks, what would you answer a poor "new believer" who asked if it was wicked to comb her hair on Sunday? Often the answer has to be "yes" for if they only perform that rite once a week, it becomes quite a formidable one. They still have to be encouraged to do it daily.

By the way, soap is pretty high now, do you know that the reason we can scold them when they do not keep clean is just plain - beans? They can't buy soap but they have used bean flour for centuries here in the place of soap. It keeps the skin delightfully soft and smooth.

1/03-1918 - p.2 L.F.M.

We are very much interested in two little Presbyterian girls over at the Women's Hospital. They graduated from Miss Snook's school and with only a week's vacation, went to the hospital where Dr. [Rosetta] Hall needed help sorely, and they have as cheerfully scrubbed floors or worked in the laundry, as they have in drug room or clinic. Now after a year of this they have been hoping to enter Medical College in Tokyo or Peking but the scholarships are not forthcoming and their families can not manage the necessary \$150 gold per year. I still hope it may come before fall.

Doctors and nurses are needed everywhere, aren't they? What do you think of this sad tale Mrs. Ross, M.D. of Syen Chun, tells - - After teaching hygiene for some little time, she received a visit from one of her pupils. Would she make her a little sponge cake? The baby was sick and doctor ordered gruel. But baby wouldn't eat gruel, perhaps it would like sponge cake.

Speaking of babies' appetites, Howard is the fattest thing that ever happened to a Moffett, and his appetite is astounding. After chewing all over his blanket and sleeve he will consume 6 oz. of milk, then howl for more until we can get his attention distracted. Then he is all smiles and good will. Sammy thinks "Be be" is a prize. It will not be long, apparently, before #2 will be able to make #1 stand around. Even now we have made some of Howard's clothes larger than Sammy's, he is growing so fast. Sammy runs and shouts enough to work off all his spare ounces. His favorite toy this Christmas was an accordion Jamie found down town. The big boys are always ready to play with him. Jamie is especially fertile in happy ideas for him. Aunt Mattie [Jamie and Charles' grandmother] writes she would rather hear of their holding baby or helping about the house than of tramps or parties. She would enjoy seeing them with the little ones.

Charles was holding a pear the other day and talking every minute. I told him to get to work but he gleefully answered, "I have so much to tell, I don't have to think" - perhaps this letter may make you think it is a family trait.

With many many thanks for the seeds and the lovely parcel -

Lovingly,

Lucia

P.S. If you have time, please write. I shall probably find myself after a while. So many new duties leave me rather dazed just now but it is loads of fun.

(from the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers)

(LXVIII.)

New York, N.Y.

BOARD LETTER NO. 426

January 10, 1918

Arthur Judson Brown

Re Amendment of the Manual

To the Chosen Mission.

Dear Friends: —

I write in this separate letter of the action on pages 37-38 of the printed minutes of your annual meeting regarding a change in the Manual. This has been carefully considered by the Chosen Committee and the Executive Council, which at the meeting of the Board the 7th instant presented the following report, which was unanimously adopted.

"The Chosen Mission at its last annual meeting took from the table a report made by its Executive Committee in 1915 entitled 'Petition to the Board of Foreign Missions for Consideration and Clearer Definition of Board and Mission Relations', and adopted the following substitute:

"We request the Board to secure a revision of the Manual so as to provide that (1) Missions as ordinarily organized in foreign lands shall be the agents of the General Assembly for the propagation of the Gospel and the planting of the Church: the Missions to have the direction of the Assembly's work within their bounds; and, by the power of review and control to be subject to its Board or other authorized agent. The Missions are also to have the right to appoint Commissioners to the Assembly. (2) That we communicate the above action to the other Missions of our Board asking them to unite with us in this request.'

"The Rev. Dr. Samuel A. Moffett, Chairman of the Mission's Executive Committee, wrote October 24th that this action had not been sent to the other Missions and that he would ask the Mission to rescind Section 2 and leave the communication to the other Missions to be made by the Board.

"The Committee and the Executive Council, after careful consideration of the proposed amendment to the Manual, are of the opinion that it is impracticable for several reasons which can be given in the discussion and explained in a letter to the Mission. It may suffice for the Board's record to call attention to the fact that the Mission's proposal would make changes in the administrative responsibilities of the Board which are incompatible with the directions of the General Assembly which, in constituting the Board, voted as follows:

"The General Assembly will superintend and conduct by its own proper authority the work of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, by a Board appointed for that purpose and directly amenable to said Assembly . . . A Board to which for the time being shall be entrusted, with such directions and instructions as may from time to time be given by the General Assembly, the superintendence of the foreign missionary operations of the Presbyterian Church.'

"Manifestly, if these functions were to be abrogated, the Board could not do the work which the General Assembly and the Church require it to do. If by Commissioners to the Assembly, the Mission means representatives of the Missions with the payment of expenses from their places of residence in the United States and with the privilege of the floor but without the right to vote, the Missions can send them now; but if the Mission means Commissioners in the Assembly's use of the term as voting members, the proposed substitute could not be adopted without an amendment to the form of the Government of the Presbyterian Church which would require the affirmative vote of the General Assembly and ratification by a majority of all the two hundred and ninety-one Presbyteries.

"We feel, however, that it would not be wise for the Board to stop at this point by giving a merely negative answer. We recognize the force of the contention that the Manual does not sufficiently indicate just what the relative powers and functions of the Board and the Missions are and that clearer definition is desirable. While the specific proposal of the Chosen Mission is impracticable, there is a fundamental question that merits constructive treatment; and this treatment should include the relations of the Missions to the churches and governments in the Mission field as well as to the Board. The form

1/10/1918 - p.2 A.J.B.

of this adjustment should not be influenced by the peculiar local conditions in one of the twenty-seven Missions, but it should have reference to the broad and permanent conditions of modern missionary work as affecting and affected by all of the Missions and fields. It should be given the most careful thought and special care should be made to secure the mature judgment of representative missionaries from various fields. Moreover, there are other important matters, particularly those growing out of the great War, on which the counsel of wise and able missionaries would be of large value. It is already apparent that the foreign missionary enterprise must face new and grave problems after the War and that there should be the most thoughtful consideration of the whole situation and of the heavily enlarged responsibilities which it will entail. Experience has showed that it is difficult to secure a satisfactory consensus of missionary opinion by having each Mission act upon a matter independently. It appears desirable to have some gathering of missionaries which will be fairly representative of all the Missions and where conclusions can be reached after mutual conference. Manifestly, such a conference cannot be held while the war is in progress; and manifestly, too, the Missions on the field ought to be given ample advance opportunity to appoint their representatives.

"The Committee and the Council therefore recommend that all the Missions be advised that, as soon as world conditions shall permit, the Board will plan to hold in New York a conference of furloughed missionaries for the consideration of questions of vital moment; and that the Missions be given notice far enough in advance to enable them, in passing upon furloughs for the year in question, to see that their members who will be at home are those whom the Missions would like to have represent them, each Mission to recommend to the Board any readjustments in the regular times of furloughs that may be necessary to give effect to this suggestion, either by ante-dating some furloughs or by deferring others."

You will note that reference is made to a number of reasons which can "be explained in a letter to the Mission." This explanation will necessarily be somewhat lengthy and will be sent to you a little later as I have a very heavy mail to get off within the next few weeks and as the Committee and the Council deemed it expedient that the written statement and the reasons should be passed upon by the Committee and the Council before mailing. The action, however, that is spread upon the records of the Boards covers the main point under present consideration and we are sure that you will be most cordially glad to learn of the representative conference which the Board hopes to hold as soon as world conditions shall permit.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Brown

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp. 150, 151.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

(LXIII)

LETTER OF A.J.B. TO J.E.A.

New York

January 23, 1918

Arthur Judson Brown

The Rev. James E. Adams, Taiku, Chosen

My Dear Dr. Adams: —

We have been thinking a good deal about the vexed question of the registration of schools and I thought at first that I would express some of the forming opinion in Board Letter No. 427 of January 10th communicating the action of the Board on the appeal of Seoul Station against the action of the Mission. I concluded, however, that it might be better to write separately about it in a personal letter so it would not be considered official, but merely as a friendly individual conference.

You are of course aware that the position of the Mission is substantially that which I independently took in my letter of June 16th, 1915 to Mr. Komatsu, which was unanimously approved at the time by the Board. I pleasantly remember the warmly appreciative words which you and others in the Mission wrote regarding that letter. I thought then and I still think that if the missionary interests had stood together on that platform we might have had some chance of gaining our point. You are also aware however that it soon developed that the missionary interests could not be held together. The ranks since have been so hopelessly broken that it is no longer possible for us to be supported in a consensus of missionary opinion in further negotiations. The officials know this quite as well as we do and of course they are gratified by what they regard as the approval of so many missionaries and of influential men in America. It is clear that they will show all possible favor to the schools that register and that the schools that do not register will be more and more seriously restricted. You will recall that Mr. Komatsu frankly said that while the government had given the existing schools the benefit of a ten year period of grace, it hoped that they would not take advantage of the full term but would at once begin to make arrangements to adapt themselves to the regulations. Signs are not wanting, as some of the missionaries have uncomfortable reason to know, that failure to do this is not pleasing to the authorities. A high Japanese official has asked: "How soon is the Pyeng Yang College going to close?" I could cite many evidences of anxiety from the letters that have been written me by the various members of the Mission -- and a China missionary who had visited Chosen writes: "It seems a forlorn hope for the church to keep up its Christian schools; they are gradually being closed by the authorities."

It appears to be clear that the present situation cannot be indefinitely prolonged and that the Mission will soon have to do one thing or the other, — that is, either make some arrangement with the Government, or deliberately prepare for the curtailment of its educational work.

Moreover the present uncertainty is highly injurious from the viewpoint of securing better financial support in America. Givers who understand the situation will not be disposed to put money into our institutions until the question is settled, especially when they have appeals from other equally important and needy institutions whose future is unclouded. It would not be honest to ask for their money without telling them of the law and the present attitude of the Government toward its enforcement; and if they are told they are likely either to decline to give at all or to say that they will wait to see how the negotiations will turn out.

The question has arisen whether our other institutions could secure the guarantees that were given in the Hojin [incorporation] of the Chosen Christian College. I believe the Mission has never passed upon the question whether the Hojin should be regarded as satisfactory although I wrote to the field at the time that it was likely to be considered as a precedent for other schools and that the Board would like to have the field opinion. Whether the Mission can now get anything more than the Chosen Christian College obtained in that Hojin is doubtful. While the Hojin is understood to be in harmony with the law it appears to be based upon the most favorable interpretation for missionaries that the officials were able to give, and they gave it in a form that cannot be revoked so far as the college is

concerned. Will they or their successors interpret the law as favorably seven years hence for a Mission that stands out to the end against their known wishes? "Aye, there's the rub."

Is it not probable that quite as favorable arrangements can now be made with the Government officials as can be made later? Indeed, may it not be that the Mission can do better now than if it were nearer the period when it may have to comply with the letter of the law or close its schools? It has advantages now that it may not have then. The present officials too, are probably as much disposed to be conciliatory as their successors are likely to be. Hope that the ten year period of grace may bring anything better is counter balanced by the fear that they may bring something worse. I may have misinterpreted some of the letters that have come to me from some of the members of the majority as well as the minority; but they have certainly given me the impression that our schools will ultimately have to register or close. Indeed, one member of the majority specifically said: "I see no hope for anything but conforming." If one intends to yield at all, is it not wiser far to do so when he can act voluntarily rather than to wait until he is forced to obey? If one does not intend to yield should he not calmly and intelligently plan to accept the consequences? It seems to me therefore that the Mission was very wise when it voted at its last annual meeting to seek to ascertain whether the Government cannot eventually find some way by which such relief will be afforded as will enable us to continue our schools with this same privilege."

Meantime the Board is unwilling to embarrass the Mission by premature pressure from New York. It feels that under present conditions the Mission should be given reasonable opportunity to see if the Mission cannot work the problem out on the field in direct negotiations with the Government.

Let me emphasize the consideration again, my dear Dr. Adams, that a letter is not to be considered an official communication in behalf of the Board. I am not trying to constrain you to do either one thing or the other, nor do I now express the opinion as to whether the Mission should register its schools or prepare to close them. I am simply trying to explain that at this distance it looks as if something will have to be done soon. It may well be that we do not read signs of the times aright; but you will appreciate the fact that we get opinions from a good many sources - members of our and other Missions in Chosen and Japan, friendly visitors, Japanese Christians and public men, and Americans outside the missionary circle whose official position or careful study of Japan enables them to form opinions. You will recall the old saying that "the spectator gets the best view of the game." I am well aware, however, that the spectator sometimes gets a wrong view, and because there is such a possibility in this case I am unwilling to have this letter bear any official character and I write it in this separate and individual way. I am sending copies to Mr. Reiner, Mr. Koons and Miss Lewis, as the principals of the educational institutions which appear to be most directly concerned at this time. Will you not let me know how the matter looks from your viewpoint?

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Brown

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp. 145-147.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

(L.)

BOARD LETTER NO. 432

Re Enlarged Committee on Education in Chosen.
To the Chosen Mission.

Dear Friends:

* * * * *

"The indefinitely prolonged stay in America of Mr. and Mrs. E.H. Miller, who returned in 1915 on account of the ill health of Mrs. Miller, has made a vacancy in our Board's representation on the faculty of the Chosen Christian College which should not be further continued in justice to the College and in loyalty to the pledge which our Board assumed. The Field Board of Managers is very desirous of having a member of the faculty who is specially qualified to take charge of the Department of Biblical Instruction in order that the Christian character and influence of the institution may have that prominence and efficiency which are so indispensable to the aims of the College, and they greatly desire the Rev. Harry A. Rhodes of our Mission for this Department. Mr. Rhodes wishes to accept this invitation and asked the Mission at its annual meeting to concur; but the Mission replied that it could not see its way clear to do so. The Field Board of Managers thereupon expressed its earnest hope that the Presbyterian Board of Managers could find some way to release Mr. Rhodes for this purpose and letters from Mr. Rhodes are to the same effect. The second section of Paragraph 40 of the Manual reads as follows:

"The Mission assigns and in general supervises the work of individual missionaries, to the end that all forms of labor may have the benefit of united counsel and may promote the interests of the work as a whole. It is proper, of course, that the views of all missionaries regarding their location and work should be heard and fully considered, and if any missionary shall be dissatisfied with the action of the Mission, an appeal to the Board for final decision can be made."

We understand that the case now in question comes under the last clause of this section and the appeal is supported by the request of the Field Board of Managers. The Committee and the Council appreciate the natural desire of the Mission to retain Mr. Rhodes in our denominational station work. On the other hand, we should take into account that the Board voted December 7, 1914, as reported to the Mission in Board Letter No. 249 of December 8 of that year, "that our share in this College is to be regarded as an integral and necessary part of the work of the Presbyterian Church in Korea and entitled to full recognition as such"; that the proposed work for Mr. Rhodes is absolutely vital to the purposes for which the College was established and is maintained; that a new man from America could not do this work as it requires one who has been on the field long enough to know the language and the people and to acquire some experience in evangelistic work; that the Field Board of Managers believes that Mr. Rhodes is eminently fitted for this particular post, and that he desires to accept it. We note, moreover, that the Mission assigned him, not to his former station at Kangkei nor to any other station for which the Mission had asked for a new missionary on its preferred list of requests for reinforcements, but to Synchronyun, where there was no vacancy in the station staff and no house for him and his family to live in except during the temporary absence of another member of the station on furlough who is now on his way back to the field. We are inclined to believe that the Mission's unwillingness to assign Mr. Rhodes to the College was influenced by the decision of the Mission in 1915 that "We (the Mission) cannot see our way clear to participate in Seoul College and we ask the Board to make arrangements to operate the College independent of the Mission." That action renders it impracticable for the Board to refer the present question of Mr. Rhodes' transfer back to the Mission or to await further word from it, especially as the appeal of the Field Board of Managers to our Board was known on the field to have been taken nearly five months ago, August 30th, and Mr. Rhodes' desire was also well known so that there has been ample time for the Mission to make any further representations on the subject if it desired to do so.

In these circumstances, there appears to be no alternative but for the Board to act on the pending

1/25/1918 - p.2 A.J.B.

appeal on its merits in harmony with Paragraph 40 of the Manual. The Committee and the Council therefore, recommend that the appeal of Mr. Rhodes and the Field Board of Managers be sustained and that the action of the Board, December 3, 1917, on the question then pending regarding the proposed transfer of Mr. Rhodes from Syenchyun Station to the evangelistic work of Seoul Station be amended by transferring Mr. Rhodes from the Syenchyun Station to the Seoul Station for the professorship referred to in the Chosen Christian College. In the Board's action of December 7, 1914, already referred to, the further statement was made that the Board will endeavor, as far as practicable, to provide its share of faculty and maintenance without lessening the force and budget that would be normally assigned to the Mission; although the Board cannot, of course, guarantee this irrespective of any conditions that may arise. In harmony with this policy, we also now recommend that the Executive Council be instructed immediately to select the best available candidate adapted to evangelistic work and appoint him and assign him to the Chosen Mission to take the place in the Mission work made vacant by the transfer of Mr. Rhodes. The Executive Council is already in correspondence with a suitable man for this purpose, whose reply has not been received at this writing, and we recommend that his appointment be referred to the Executive Council with power.

This report was unanimously adopted. As it was drawn with a view to making it self-explanatory, I need only add that an essential element in the matter was the immediate appointment of a man to take Mr. Rhodes' place in the work of the Mission. I confidently expect to be able to announce his name within a few days, as we have approved his papers, have asked him to accept the appointment and now only await his reply.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Brown

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp. 93 - 95.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

Yokohama, Japan

January 28, 1918

Henry H. Loomis
[Agent of the American Bible Society in Japan]

Dear Dr. Brown [letter to Dr. Arthur Judson Brown]

I am sending to you a book that shows the progress that is being made by the Japanese in Korea. I think you will find it of interest. I think all friends of Korea will be thankful for the good work that has been done and is still going on. What a contrast this is in what there was before the Japanese occupation. And what an advantage this is to the inspiring work. I am told that Gen. (who figured so prominently in the Conspiracy Case) is now satisfied that the Japanese administration has been a benefit to the country. And how much better than Russian control.

I see that Rev. Mr. Rhodes of your Mission has been telling the people in America that it is possible to evangelize Japan and China by means of Korean evangelists. To one who knows the conditions such a statement is utterly absurd; and it is a pity to deceive the people and discredit the in this way.

Among the other misfortunes that have come to Korea was the appointment by China of a Government adviser named von Mollendorf, who was a German of the worst type. He began his drunken career by adopting the Korean style, taking openly a concubine, and boasting that he wanted to become one of themselves, while his poor wife revealed to Dr. Allen that her life was one of absolute wretchedness.

In an interview that I had with him of about half an hour he made these startling statements as to the policy that he was to [follow] in order to promote the welfare of the country.

First, that in case the King's Father, the Tai Won Kun, should not concede to his plans they would cut off his head.

Second, in case there was a deficiency in the Treasury the current coinage should be declared useless and a new and still more debased currency forced upon the people. In this way all the money that was required would be realized.

Third, if any of the proposed schemes were in conflict with the treaties the treaties would be ignored, i.e. treated as "scraps of paper".

This was the representative in Korea of modern Christian civilization; and whose influence the missionaries had to contend.

The Russians also sent to Korea as their Minister a man named Waeber, who was also a German, possessed of genius of the highest type; and devoted to the one project of gaining the control of the country. To accomplish his purpose he and his accomplished wife sought in every possible way to win favor with the people and missionaries; and at the same time to discredit the Japanese.

Such was their skill and success that I suppose if a vote had been taken as to which country it would be best for Korea to be under there would have been a unanimous vote in favor of Russia. As you know, even the King took refuge in the Russian Legation from his own people and the Japanese.

I am confident that much of the dislike and opposition to the Japanese in Korea was caused by the two men whom I have mentioned, and it is very probable that had it not been for their influence there

1/28/1918 - p.2 H. L.

would have been no "Conspiracy Case".

I was reading yesterday in the last number of the "Japan Evangelist" how that one of the most popular and successful ministers among the Japanese lost his faith entirely by reading the works of the German Higher Critics. After fifteen years of wandering and finding no peace, he is now a most successful worker in connection with the Salvation Army. At the present time his work as an evangelist is being wonderfully blessed.

A little grandson of ours was overheard by his mother explaining to his younger brother (who was just recovering from the measles) why it was there were so many bad diseases going about the country all the time and causing so much pain to the children, and the reason he gave was "There are so many Germans [he meant to say "germs"] in the air". I think he has got pretty near the heart of the matter.

We are very thankful to be here in our quiet home and to watch the progress of God's Kingdom in spite of the horrors of war.

With kindest regards,
Yours most cordially,

H. Loomis

(from the microfilm records of the Board of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, PA, Series II, Reel #6, Record Group 140-4-26)

(LXX)
New York, N.Y.

BOARD LETTER NO. 436
February 14, 1918

Arthur J. Brown

In Re Brief from the Executive Committee of the Chosen Mission.

Dear Friends: -

After the action of the Board, January 7th, on the request on pp. 37-38 of the Minutes of your annual meeting regarding the relations of the Mission and the Board, as announced in Board Letter No. 426 of January 10th, we received the Rev. Dr. James E. Adams' official letter of December 7th with "A Brief on the Subject of Desirability of an Adjustment Between Home Base and Field as Relates to Field Administration." Dr. Adams enclosed another copy of the Brief together with a covering letter addressed to the Executive Commission of the General Assembly which he requested us to forward. We have, therefore, sent the latter documents to the Executive Commission together with a copy of the action of the Board on the report of its Chosen Committee and the Executive Council as follows:

"The Chosen Committee and the Executive Council presented the following report, which was received and the recommendation adopted:

"Since the action of the Board, January 7th in reply to a request of the Chosen Mission asking for a change in the paragraphs of the Manual which relate to the powers and duties of the Board in relation to the Missions, we have received the Rev. Dr. James E. Adams' letter of December 7th, as Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Mission, enclosing *A Brief on the Subject of the Desirability of an Adjustment Between Home Base and Field Administration.*" Dr. Adams also encloses a letter to the Chairman of the Executive Commission of the General Assembly with another copy of the *Brief* which he asks the Board to forward to the Executive Commission. The Chosen Committee and the Executive Council recommend that the representatives of the Board who are to attend the next meeting of the Executive Commission be instructed to deliver the documents referred to and to present the following considerations from the viewpoint of the Board.

"1. Dr. Adams states that the Executive Committee of the Mission 'endorsed the Brief as a whole.' Approved 'the suggested amendment to the Manual as given in Article 6, Section C, of the Brief,' and directed 'that a copy of the Brief be sent to each station.' The 'suggested amendment' however, differs from that adopted by the Mission at its annual meeting, and there is nothing to show that the Executive Committee had power to alter an action of the Mission without the express action of the Mission itself, [a] vote which does not appear to have been taken. The Minutes of the Annual Meeting for 1911, page 97, state that Sec. 1, Art. 1, was amended so as to include the following: 'No vote shall be declared until all the Stations concerned have had opportunity to express their opinions, and in case any Station protests against the action, this protest, together with the votes already cast shall be returned to the Stations and a revote taken.' The Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Mission of November 17-20, show that the Mission voted through its Stations on the recommendation of its Executive Committee 'that clause 2, section 19 of last year's Executive Committee's report be rescinded' the vote recorded as 'Affirmative, 41; negative 17.' But the Mission does not appear to have voted on the Executive Committee's substitute for the remainder and major part of the Mission's action at its Annual Meeting. The correspondence indicates too that while the Brief was circulated among the Stations, it was not voted on by them as the rules of the Mission require when recommendations of the Committee are to be considered authoritative expressions of the Mission's mind. The Brief, like the modification, does not appear to be an action of the Mission, but an explanation and an advocacy of the request of the Executive Committee. Attention is called to this point not in the interest of the Board which is quite willing to meet the issue, but in the interest of the Mission itself. It is not clear that the Board would be justified in considering the present request and the Brief as actions of the Mission, and this doubt is strengthened by the fact that already protests have been received from one station and from some other members of the Mission.

"2. The suggested amendment with its intent as set forth in the Brief does not remedy the essential defects of the Mission's action at Annual Meeting and the statements of the Brief in defense of it appear to be based upon a misinterpretation of facts and of the methods of missionary administration which the General Assembly has found to be necessary to the best interests of the work. So misleading are some of the statements of the Brief that we feel that it would be unjust to the Chosen missionaries as a body if the Board, the other Missions and the Executive Commission of the Assembly were to regard the Brief as a mature and adequate expression of their position unless they shall endorse it as such, which thus far they have not done to our knowledge.

"3. Inasmuch as the Brief calls for a change in the organic relationship of the General Assembly, through

its appointed agency, not only to the Chosen Mission, but to all the twenty seven foreign missions of the church, it would be manifestly unjust to ask the Executive Commission of the General Assembly or the Assembly itself to consider it on the request of a single Mission until and unless it has been passed by other Missions also since their common rights are involved. This consideration is emphasized by the fact that some furloughed members of Missions who have seen the Chosen proposal have strongly objected to it as uncalled for by the situation as they understand it and as in their judgment not representative of the attitude of their respective Missions. The Chosen Mission at its annual meeting recognized the right of other Missions to be consulted; but its action has not yet been sent them for reasons stated in the Rev. Dr. Samuel A. Moffett's letter of October 24, 1917. Manifestly the present action of the Executive Committee stops the Board from sending the action of the Mission, and we are not sure that we have the right to send them the Executive Committee's substitute as the authorized expression of the Mission's mind. There is not time to hear from the other Missions anyway before the next General Assembly, as the Annual Meetings are held in the summer and autumn, and some of them not till December.

"4. The Board at its meeting January 7th, approved our recommendation that, after the close of the war, the Board arrange for a general conference of the representatives of all the Missions who may be available. We do not deem it proper to place on the docket of that conference any proposal that would call for a change in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church or challenge the absolute right and duty of the General Assembly to 'superintend and conduct by its own proper authority the work of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church by a Board appointed for that purpose and directly amenable to said Assembly.' We believe that the Church regards this question as closed, nor do we deem it advisable to ask that it be reopened. We do feel however that the Chosen missionaries are right in urging that the paragraphs of the Manual which relate to the powers and duties of the Missions in their relations to the Board need clearer definition. The Executive Council has had this question under consideration for some time and has already decided to place it on the docket for the General Conference after the War. Meantime the 'suggested amendment' and 'Brief' of the Executive Committee of the Chosen Mission do not impress us as justifying a reconsideration of the report which the Board adopted January 7th. We feel moreover that the Mission is entitled to an opportunity to reconsider the whole matter at its annual meeting in the light of the Board's action of January 7th, the action that is taken today, and the explanatory letter that is to be drafted by the Secretary in charge."

I may add that the personal opinion of some of us that the Overture now under consideration by the Executive Commission and to which Dr. Adams refers as the special reason for referring the matter to that body at this time, appears to concern the relation of the General Assembly's Board of Home Missions to the work that is conducted within and under the jurisdiction of the Presbyteries in the United States whose constitutional rights are believed to be affected. A reading of the Overture, a copy of which is before me, strengthens this conviction. It gives as the reason for objecting to the proposed change in the Form of Government, "the possible annoyance of Presbyteries and their missionaries in their prosecution of their home missionary work." It appears to have no relation to the General Assembly's Board of Foreign Missions and the Missions on the Foreign Field which are non-Presbyterial bodies. I am informed by one who is connected with the Executive Commission that "In my opinion no changes which are proposed to be made will affect the Board of Foreign Missions."

The fuller letter of explanation referred to in the Board letter of January 10th, is being drafted and will be mailed to you in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Brown

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp. 153 - 155.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

(IXIV.)

Taiku, Chosen

LETTER OF J.E.A. TO A.J.B.

March 15, 1918

James E. Adams

Rev. A.J. Brown, D.D., 156 5th Ave., New York

My Dear Dr. Brown: -

Your letter of January 23, 1918, came some days ago and I have laid it by for occasional re-reading and consideration, until I should have some clearly defined conclusions to give in reply. You will pardon the delay.

I may state my general conclusions in a few words. I think the tone and entire drift of your letter a mistaken one, with regard to the situation here. I have charge of one of the middle schools of the Mission of which there are but four boys schools in the country. At one time I had the same apprehension[s] which you seem to have; but consequent experience has led me to largely lose them. I believe the Administration, while a red tape one, is playing fair on the Ordinance which it itself made, and is following it out without partiality to all. I believe that there has not been a previous time when the relation[s] between Administration and Missions have been more cordial. The present Administration has frankly said to the Australian Presbyterian Mission that teaching the Bible outside of official school hours and using school buildings for it is not contrary to the Ordinance, and has given Mr. Koons permission to do so if he wished to conform. It as frankly says and so instructs its provincial officials, that old schools are not to be interfered with but to be given their present full privileges until 1925. This however, is not permitted for those schools which conformed when the Ordinance was not so interpreted. They made their own bed. All of my own relations in connection with my school with the local and provincial authorities are most agreeable. They do everything they can for me, come out to all my school functions, and are most cordial. I have lately had my official curriculum changed so as to conform to the Government one, and it was done for me by the head officials in Seoul, with no question and with religious instruction left in. When the Ordinance was first passed all were officially asked what they proposed to do. I sent in a written reply to the effect that I would change the curriculum to the Government one as quickly as possible, with the exception of religious instruction. This I would continue until the law did not permit it. The reply was acknowledged by Mr. Usami himself. Last year I had an insurrection in the school. My head Japanese teacher went into the dormitory and beat up a student. I was away at Seoul. The students struck. The Japanese [teacher] informed the police that the riot was against him because he was a Japanese. The police began to loiter round. I came back and at once went into the matter. I discharged the teacher and expelled the student. The other students struck on me. I called them in one by one and gave them the choice of continuing and obeying rules or leaving. With one exception they all said they would leave. Then I ordered them out of the dormitories and home. At that they broke and wanted back. It resulted in about six expulsions. No finer opportunity could have been had for the officials if they had wanted to make trouble. Instead the mayor's office sent out word that they had watched the matter closely and were greatly pleased with the way I had handled it. The troubles in Sensen have wholly passed and now most cordial relations exist. In Pyeng Yang it was thought lately that they were persecuting the school and arresting students. But it was ascertained that an organization really existed and some of the students were in it, having made a covenant and signed it with their blood to liberate the country and were paying money for that purpose. Those guilty were kept and those not in it were released. What else could the police do? The fault was in the students, not in the Government, and it would have been the same even though it were a conforming school.

Unquestionably the Administration would like for us to conform. But they themselves made the Ordinance and put all the provisions in it. They put the particular ten year one in because they knew the difficulty in which it placed us. But they put it in themselves, and they are dealing impartially with us as we avail ourselves of it. I know of no evidence to the contrary.

I am aware that what may not improperly be called a campaign has been made both here and in the States (doubtless with a sincere belief in the position) to the effect that this is not the case, that the Administration is not, and will not, follow the letter of the Ordinance, and that its purpose is to discriminate

against schools availing themselves of its provisions, and that because of this, in the end, such schools will surely only hang themselves. I think such men do the Administration an injustice. In the position also of those related to the Seoul institution, the motive is so apparent as to rather cause one to smile. You know the old story of the fox which lost its tail. Our Consular office also from the very beginning has lent all its influence to carry the conforming side. How very effective, however, these representations have been is apparent in what you yourself assume as facts of the situation in your letter, and the same is true of other Boards at home. I have heard the story of the high authority you quote. It has been repeatedly and effectively placed here on the field also. But the same authority has talked quite differently to myself with regard to the ten years provision.

With regard to the privileges you mention as secured by the Seoul College in its charter, you must not forget Doctor, that the great bulk of the missionaries on the field, most of whom are well acquainted with the matter, with the Administration and the Ordinance, do not look upon the institution as having secured any particular privileges. So far as I know only two things can be said. It has guaranteed Christian teachers. But no question ever has or ever will arise on that point so long as Christian teachers are available. And when they are not, what then? Who grants the license to the teacher, and decides whether they are suitable? If teachers the Administration thinks are suitable are not securable, will they permit the positions to stand vacant? The other is the granting of the Theological Department (Biblical). All the other departments are strictly and absolutely secularized. No student can enroll in two departments at once. Religion is guaranteed in the one. I understand that two students are entered in that department, and this is but the reasonable and natural result. It was the conditions of the Hojin that definitely and finally turned the Southern Presbyterian Mission, the second largest in the country, away from the institution. The bulk of the missionaries in the country regard the taking out of the Hojin as having been at least as distinctly and probably more effectually a destruction of the possibilities of proper Christian education for the future Church of Christ in the country, as the conforming of the Methodist Pai Chai school, of which you have spoken in such strong terms. Our own Mission has spoken definitely with regard to its judgment in the matter; as definitely as it properly could under the circumstances; and with sufficient definiteness to make its meaning clear. This I explained at the time. I refer to actions 12 and 26 in the report of the Educational Committee of the Annual Meeting of 1916. (Minutes page 115, 118.) These actions were taken after the receipt of your letter of inquiry to individual members of the Mission, on this subject.

My own judgment is that the necessary minimum that makes continuance possible under the revised ordinance has been secured by Mr. Engle and Mr. Koons. This, however, is only an absolute minimum. No one regards it as anywhere approaching the proper privileges of the Church of Christ for Christian Education. Under the Ordinance, in the providence of God, seven years are still open to us. There is no proof that the Administration has any malign purposes or is not playing fair, on its own Ordinance. Under such circumstances I would say with Jehoshaphat, "O Judah and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem, believe in the Lord your God. So shall ye be established" and I would continue rather to wait upon Him, than to rush to shut the door in his face.

I have written thus frankly, because your letter was a personal one, as is this. Believe me,

Yours affectionately,

James E. Adams

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp. 147, 148.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

(LXXIII.)

Taiku, Chosen

LETTER OF J.E.A. TO A.J.B.

May 15, 1918

James E. Adams

Rev. A.J. Brown, D.D., 156 5th Ave., New York City

My Dear Dr. Brown.

I enclose a sheet giving the result of the votes on the various recommendations of the Executive Committee at its regular meeting at Taiku, March 29 to April 1, 1918.

Sec. 195. That we recommend to the Mission that in view of the prolonged and unfortunate discussion concerning the relation of Board and Mission; and the confusion arising from it to the injury of the work; and in view of the Board's statement that,

"We recognize the force of the statement that the Manual does not sufficiently indicate just what the relative powers of the Board and Mission are, and that clearer definition is desirable" and its proposal for a conference of furloughed missionaries for the consideration of matters of vital moment, and

Believing that in this Conference the General Assembly should also be represented, we petition the General Assembly as follows:

In accord with the original constituting action of 1837 to the effect that the functions entrusted were for the time being and with such directions and instructions as from time to time may be given by the General Assembly, we petition the Assembly that it appoint a Commission of five for the following purpose.

1. The Commission as representing the Assembly shall participate in the proposed conference.
2. It shall go carefully and thoroughly into the whole problem of democratic self-government upon the field; its proper sphere in accord with Presbyterian principles; and its relation, under present conditions, with proper Board authority.
3. It shall frame on this basis such recommendations as seem to it wise, for the adjustment and definition of the respective functions of Board and Mission in field matters, particularly in the case of the larger Missions; and present the same to the General Assembly for its action; to the end that suitable directions and instructions may be given the Assembly's operating organizations both at home and abroad, and that the present confusion may no longer work to the continued injury of our Lord's service.

Affirmative 37, Negative 8. Not voting 14. Not passed.

This is self-explanatory. It was proposed to the Mission as the simplest and most natural way out of an apparent impasse. The Mission had asked for larger powers of self-determination than the present system gives. The Board had replied that it was impossible to grant this because of the character of the Assembly's action constituting the Board. In the Board's proposal of the post war conference, accompanying the answer, while matters of definition are suggested as desirable, enlarged powers of self determination do not enter in for consideration. In the subsequent brief approved by the Executive Committee and the suggested amendment made by Mr. Whittemore, Mr. Holdcroft and myself at the request of the Board representatives, also approved by the Committee, the Board's action apparently reinforces this interpretation. It has not authority to consider any limitation of its own authority in order to enlarge self-determination on the field. In view of this, the petition to the Assembly was recommended, with the request to the Board to join with us in it. I gather from communications from the various stations that while there seems comparative unanimity with regard to the idea in the petition, it failed because of a difference of opinion as to time and method.

With affectionate regards,

Yours in the Blessed Service,

James E. Adams

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp. 175, 176.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

(LXXI)

New York, N.Y.

BOARD LETTER NO. 456

May 31, 1918

Arthur Judson Brown

In Re Brief from the Executive Committee of the Chosen Mission.

To the Chosen Mission.

Dear Friends: —

You will recall that Board Letter No. 426 of January 10 and No. 436 of February 14, gave preliminary replies of the Board to the action of your last annual meeting on a revision of the Manual and to the substitute of your Executive Committee given in the Rev. Dr. James E. Adams' official letter of December 7, 1917, and his accompanying "Brief", one copy of the latter being addressed to the Board and another to the Executive Commission of the General Assembly; that the Board directed that a fuller and more detailed statement of the reasons which influenced its action should be drafted for a letter. Such a statement was prepared under the title: "Memorandum on Actions of the Chosen Mission and Its Executive Committee Regarding Readjustment of the Powers of the Board and the Mission." The Memorandum had been held for a time, partly because it appeared advisable to wait to see whether the Executive Commission of the General Assembly desired to go into the matter in a way which would call for a detailed account of the Board's position; and partly because of the hope that some further word might come from the Mission which would make its use unnecessary. No word came from the Executive Commission until the day before we left for the meeting of the General Assembly, when we received the following communication:

"These papers are returned because the Executive Commission has reported to the Assembly recommending no action on Chapter XVIII, Form of Government."

The Assembly adopted the recommendation of its Executive Commission. I did not therefore present the Memorandum to the Assembly or its Executive Commission and I sincerely hope that no necessity will develop for doing so.

Personally, I wish that the matter could be dropped here, as I confess that I am growing very weary of this continued controversy which, I fear, is doing no small harm to the Mission. No intimation, however, has come from the field that the majority of the Mission and the Executive Committee have receded from their position. On the contrary, we learn that your Executive Committee recently recommended that an appeal be made directly to the General Assembly to appoint a Commission to attend the Conference which the Board is planning to hold with furloughed missionaries after the war; this Commission to take into its own hands the framing of such recommendations as might be deemed desirable. We are at a loss to understand this proposal unless it was made on the assumption that the object of the Conference is to settle a dispute between the Missions and the Board and that they cannot be trusted to adjust it between themselves. We understand that, while this proposal failed to receive the two-thirds vote which the rules of the Mission require, it actually secured the votes of a majority of the members of the Mission and lacked only two or three votes of the requisite two-thirds. Moreover, the request of your Executive Committee of December 7, 1917, was sent to the Board as well as to the Executive Commission of the General Assembly, and as the Board's reply stated that it would be followed by a fuller explanation, you of course have a right to that explanation in order that you may know what the Board's reasons are. I therefore avail myself of the first opportunity after my return from the General Assembly to send you this Memorandum which I now enclose.

I could not easily tell you, dear friends, how painful this whole matter is to me and with what reluctance I have written about it. The official actions that you have taken, however, and the Brief sent by your Executive Committee, not only to the Board but to the Executive Commission of the General Assembly impressed the Board, myself included, with the conviction that it was absolutely necessary to state the case with some fullness and with entire frankness. Many of you have very cordially told me at various times that you regard me as in a special sense your friend. I venture to hope, therefore, that you will attach some weight to my candid statement that the position to which the majority of the Mission and its Executive Committee have committed themselves impresses me as quite impossible and that even if it could be brought about, it would be gravely injurious to the best interests of the work. In an appeal to the General Assembly against some of the specific decisions of the Board, within a reasonable time after they were taken, you would have had good standing ground and the sympathy of a minority in the Board. But your present contention is quite a different matter. The Board's opinion you know. As for the General Assembly and the Home Church, I do not believe that they will ever

sustain your present contention, and I am very sure that if they were to do so, the ultimate effect upon your work would be so disastrous that the approval would soon be reversed. A Brief from the field and the related correspondence, wrote me:

"To my mind, such change as asked for by the Brief would be suicidal to the work of the Presbyterian Church in mission fields. No business man would contribute funds in this country towards missionary activities that would be subject to such direction and control as proposed."

I trust, dear friends, that you will pardon this candid word. It is meant in all kindness as well as in all honesty, by one who is more deeply troubled than you can perhaps realize; who, in some other matters has stood up for you against strong contrary opinions, and who earnestly desires to see the sacred cause of world evangelization strengthened in every possible way.

Sincerely yours,
Arthur J. Brown

Enclosure

MEMORANDUM

Memorandum on Actions of the Chosen Mission and Its Executive Committee Regarding Readjustment of the Powers of the Board and the Mission

(This Memorandum has been drafted by direction of the Board to supplement and more fully explain the actions of the Board, January 7 and February 4, 1918, in reply to the requests of the Chosen Mission referred to below. While I have written most of it, some parts have been contributed by others. As the Memorandum is intended to be representative rather than individual, it has not been deemed necessary to differentiate authors by quotation marks except as indicated. — Arthur J. Brown, Secretary.)

In 1915, the Executive Committee of the Chosen Mission presented to the Mission a draft of a "Petition to the Board for Consideration and Clearer definition of Board and Mission Relations," which included the following recommendation:

"We respectfully petition the Board that it provide that, although as in the past the Board under its authority of 'review and control' possess the power of veto over the actions of the Mission, yet in Field Matters only in the rare cases where the Mission would deem it necessary, the Mission shall have the right to act again upon the matter voted, and, should it repeat its former action by a two-thirds vote, the Mission's judgment shall finally decide the matter, subject only to appeal to the General Assembly."

The significance of this lay in the Mission's convictions regarding certain decisions of the Board and in the interpretation of the phrase "Field Matters," both of which will be referred to in later pages of this Memorandum.

After discussion and consultation with Secretary Robert E. Speer of the Board, who was then visiting Chosen, the Mission laid the Petition upon the table for one year. The following year, the Mission did not take it from the table. In the Spring of 1917, a number of pastors in the United States and one of the religious weekly papers received letters from members of the Mission urging the advisability of enlarging the powers of the Mission and characterizing the present relationship with the Board as "outgrown," "unsound," "a very real peril to the work," "an absolute dictatorship," etc. At the suggestion of a member of the Mission who was at home on furlough, thirty-nine members of the Mission on the field cabled a request to the General Assembly. The Board was not informed about this correspondence until pastors and elders in Maryland, Missouri, Illinois, California and New Jersey sent to us the letters that they had received, nor was the Board told by the missionaries about the cable to the General Assembly. We have never yet received a copy of that cable, although twice asked for. The letters and cable were sent by individual missionaries without authorization by the Mission, but the signers were members of the majority in the Mission and undoubtedly believed that they were expressing the prevailing opinion. The cable was presented to the Assembly's Standing Committee of Foreign Missions which heard the explanations of two members of the Mission who were present and also Secretary Stanley White, of the Board. The result was the following recommendation to the Assembly which unanimously adopted it:

"The Assembly notes with special interest the Board's policy of securing more efficient local

administration in the various mission fields including the largest amount of democratic self-government in the Missions, and recommends that whenever conditions permit or render it advantageous, in the judgment of the Board, further steps be taken in the same direction, especially in the case of its largest Missions."

It will be noted that this action calls for no change in the Board's powers or methods but that on the contrary it approves the course that the Board has long been pursuing, as we shall note more fully on a later page.

June 5th and 18th and September 14th, 1917, representatives of the Board held personal conferences with members of the Mission who were then at home on furlough, seventeen missionaries being present at the first conference, twelve at the second, and four at the third, including the Rev. Dr. James E. Adams, who was Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Mission and who drafted the "Petition" in 1915 and the letter and newspaper article in 1917.

At the annual meeting of the Mission in June, 1917, the Mission took the Petition of 1915 from the table and adopted the following as a substitute:

"(1) That we request the Board to secure a revision of the Manual so as to provide that Missions as ordinarily organized in foreign lands shall be the agents of the General Assembly for the propagation of the Gospel and the planting of the Church: the Missions to have the direction of the Assembly's work within their bounds; and, by the power of review and control to be subject to its Board or other authorized agent. The Missions are also to have the right to appoint Commissioners to the Assembly.

"(2) That we communicate the above action to the other Missions of our Board asking them to unite with us in this request."

The last sentence was subsequently withdrawn and the correspondence with other Missions was left to the Board. The Board's Committee on Chosen and the Executive Council, after careful consideration of the whole matter, reported to the Board January 7, 1918, that in their united judgment the proposed amendment was impracticable, indicated some of the vital objections, and stated that a fuller explanation would be sent to the field in a Board letter. The report was unanimously adopted. About a week later, the Board received from the Executive Committee of the Mission a substitute for the Mission's proposal together with an explanatory "Brief" prepared by the Chairman of the Committee, Dr. Adams. This substitute and "Brief" were referred to the Board's Committee on Chosen and Executive Council, whose adverse report was unanimously adopted by the Board, February 4th.

The additional copy of the Brief and the covering letter addressed to the Executive Commission of the General Assembly were forwarded as requested together with a copy of the Board's action.

The present Memorandum deals with the whole question as raised by the four communications referred to, namely, "The Petition" considered by the Mission in 1915, the substitute adopted in 1917, the substitute for that substitute adopted by the Mission's Executive Committee, and the "Brief" in advocacy of it by Dr. Adams. While the four documents differ in phraseology and in certain details, the same idea runs through them all, and the related correspondence, which is voluminous, and the letters sent to friends in the home Church clearly show that they have the same purpose.

We may observe at the outset that the problem that has been raised is natural and perhaps inevitable. It would be unfortunate if the Mission and the Board were not seeking for better ways of conducting missionary work. So long as there is life in the movement there will be self-criticism. It has been so from the earliest days, and there have been many times when the issues raised were far more acute and strained than they are now. From the beginning there have been difficulties, sometimes personal, sometimes of principle and of policy between the individual and his station, between the station and the Mission, between neighboring Missions, and between a Mission and the home Board. Anyone who studies the history of modern Missions in detail will meet with numerous issues of this kind. A great deal of progress has been made in wise adjustment and distribution of responsibility and authority since those early days, and we do not doubt that there is much progress still to be made.

The great difficulty is that the issues when raised are too often mixed with personal elements tinged with dissension and distrust. The questions involved, however, are questions which should be viewed dispassionately as problems in the discovery of the truest plan and the wisest method. They can never really be rightly settled otherwise. All discussions carried on and all adjustments reached in an atmosphere of suspicion are in danger of being tainted with un-Christian feelings and of falling short of the wisdom and love of the mind

of Christ. At the recent meeting of the American Medical Association, Dr. Mayo, the President, said that in his judgment the words and feelings of men contain toxins which react upon their spirit and judgment, and that suspicion and distrust pour poison into personality as real as any chemical taint. If the majority of the Chosen missionaries, accordingly, have lost confidence in and feel distrust toward the Board as some of them have declared to be the case, they are in a less advantageous position to contribute to the solution of a great problem in mission policy than they would be otherwise and less so than the Board which has not lost confidence in the Mission although questioning its judgment on certain questions.

The objections to the Chosen proposals, including those mentioned in the Board's actions, may be indicated as follows:

First: The substitute adopted by the Mission at its last annual meeting is incompatible with the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church since it asks the Board, which is not an ecclesiastical body and has no ecclesiastical authority, to secure for the Missions, "the right to appoint commissioners to the General Assembly." Presbyteries alone can appoint such commissioners. If the Mission means representatives of the Missions with the payment of expenses from their places of residence in the United States and with the privilege of the floor on Foreign Missions but without the right to vote, the Mission can send them now; but if the Mission means Commissioners in the Assembly's use of the term as voting members, the proposed substitute could not be adopted without an amendment to the Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church which would require the affirmative vote of the General Assembly and ratification by a majority of all the two hundred and ninety-one Presbyteries.

The Mission's proposal would make changes in the administrative responsibilities of the Board which are incompatible with the directions of the General Assembly which, in constituting the Board, voted as follows:

"The General Assembly will superintend and conduct by its own authority the work of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, by a Board appointed for that purpose and directly amenable to said Assembly; - - - a Board to which for the time being shall be intrusted, with such directions and instructions as may from time to time be given by the General Assembly, the superintendence of the foreign missionary operations of the Presbyterian Church."

General Assemblies ever since the original decision have acted in accord with this principle. Manifestly, the Board has no power to alter the functions which the General Assembly has assigned to it, and as manifestly - if these functions were to be abrogated, the Board could not do the work which the General Assembly and the Church require it to do.

Indeed the proposal would in effect eliminate the General Assembly itself as the body to "superintend and conduct the work of Foreign Missions." The General Assembly consists of nearly a thousand men, meets only once a year, remains in session for only seven working days, must review the entire work of the Church at home as well as abroad, and is able to devote to Foreign Missions only two business hours in an entire annual meeting. It would be manifestly impossible for the General Assembly to deal with a large number of widely separated Missions in any such way as would "superintend and conduct the work of Foreign Missions." It is true that the General Assembly appoints a Standing Committee on Foreign Missions; but this Committee seldom includes more than three or four men who have had special opportunity to acquaint themselves with the policies, methods, and administrative details of the foreign missionary enterprise. They are friendly pastors and elders who are eager to help in increasing the interest of the Commissioners and the home churches in Missions and to encourage the missionaries on the field. They cannot go into complicated questions of detail in particular Missions and they do not attempt to do so. The Committee can seldom begin its work till the third day of the Assembly, and it must meet at odd times between sessions when committee meetings are necessarily hurried and subject to many interruptions. Moreover, the General Assembly is a declarative and not an administrative body. It has large administrative powers, but it has never attempted to exercise them directly but has invariably committed them to boards and permanent committees. If the Assembly found this method necessary in 1837 when the Assembly was a compact body of 263 commissioners dealing with the comparatively simple affairs of a Church of 220,557 communicants in a narrow home territory, only 42 foreign missionaries and a budget of \$35,000, how much more necessary is it when the Assembly numbers 873 members dealing with the vast and complicated work of 1,604,045 communicants scattered over the entire breadth of the continent, and a foreign missionary enterprise involving an annual expenditure of over \$3,000,000, and requiring an intensive acquaintance with fields, personnel, problems and relationships which can be acquired only by men who can

concentrate attention upon them through a series of years. If the Assembly had not in that early day delegated its authority to a Board, the demand for such an action at this time would be loud and insistent. To say that the Assembly should exercise its superintendence over the foreign missionary enterprise by direct dealing in such circumstances with twenty-seven missions is equivalent to saying that it should not exercise it at all. The only possible way for the General Assembly to exercise its control is the present way - namely, to "superintend and conduct the work by a Board appointed for that purpose and directly amenable to said Assembly." The proposed plan would make Missions and Missionaries responsible to no one. As active members and Presbyters of the Presbyterian Church of Chosen, which is as independent of our General Assembly as the Presbyterian Church of Canada, it is doubtful whether our General Assembly can constitutionally regard the Chosen missionaries as subject to its ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and their present proposal would remove them from its administrative jurisdiction. The authority which the proposal would set up is in remote lands and is inaccessible to practicable criticism or review by an annual meeting in America. The annual deliverances of the General Assembly indicate no disposition to alter its methods of foreign missionary administration through the Board. On the contrary, repeated actions down to the present express deepening satisfaction with the present arrangement. The last Assembly declared through its Standing Committee that it was "deeply impressed by the exceptional character of the conditions under which the work of the Board has been done and the complex nature of the problems raised," and it unanimously voted that:

"The Assembly expresses its appreciation of the admirable organization of the Board of Foreign Missions, realizing the largeness and complexity of its work, demanding as it does extraordinary care and discretion in its administration."

Second: The proposal would destroy the administrative unity of the foreign missionary work of the Church and distribute it among twenty-seven Missions scattered over sixteen different countries in distant parts of the world, making each one of them virtually independent of the others and with no effective agency to co-ordinate their policies and methods. Such distant and disconnected agencies could not command the confidence of the home Church and would have no instrumentality as competent as the Board to represent them before the home constituency. The plan would result in dividing the Missions into groups, sustaining different relationships to the home Church, and it would do this upon an indefinable principle. Just how many missionaries should there be on a given field, and for how long a period in order to make the Chosen proposal applicable? And suppose through deaths and resignations the size of the Mission falls below the prescribed standard, would it automatically lose its autonomy? Anything like unity of policy throughout the whole mission field would be impracticable. One autonomous Mission might adopt principles wholly at variance with those which a neighboring Mission would adopt; the Missions of Chosen and Japan proper, for example. The authority of the General Assembly, exercised in such a casual and indirect way, would not secure unity. It has not done so even in the Presbyteries at home. A Presbytery in the United States has the correctives of the proximity of other Presbyteries, its membership with them in a Synod, and its direct relationship to the General Assembly in the same country; but Missions are so widely separated that they cannot act as correctives of one another or have any bond of union whatever except through the Board. The principle of the proposal, moreover, would be disruptive inside each Mission, for the arguments of experience and proximity to the work, which are urged by the Mission as against the Board, are still more valid in behalf of the station as against the Mission. There are stations in Chosen which are larger than entire Missions of the Board in other fields. Such a station might justly claim that it "should be given in its distinctive field an authority commensurate with its responsibilities."

Third: The "Brief" is largely based upon the assumption that there is a proper "comparison between the organic principles of Presbyterianism as an administrative system" and "the operative system of our Foreign Missions work" so that the relation of Presbyteries and Synods to the General Assembly should be deemed the model to which the relation of the Missions on the foreign field to the General Assembly's Board of Foreign Missions should be conformed. This is an altogether unwarranted assumption. The comparison is between systems that cannot be related in that way. Their relationships are not parallel and their organizations are entirely different. A local church is not a body whose members have been appointed by any one of the higher judicatories in the series and dependent upon it for its existence and its support. It is a practically democratic combination, self-constituted, self-supporting and self-governing, except in its relationship to other similar bodies, and then it voluntarily submits itself to the Government of a body representative of all the similar groups

of which it is one. A similar relationship exists between these various representative groups in their relationship to another representative body which governs the broader relationships, and so on up to the General Assembly. No one of these groups (Church, Presbytery and Synod) is dependent financially upon one of the higher courts, nor, as a rule, did it get its existence by the will of the higher court. On the contrary, the lower body first existed and the higher came into existence at the combined will of a number of the basic groups. Moreover, the lower courts elect the members of the higher ones.

The Mission is and of necessity must be organized on a fundamentally different principle. It is not composed of representatives elected by its subordinate bodies, and responsible to them, but of persons sent out in accordance with the expressed will of the highest Presbyterian Court, the General Assembly, which, desiring to establish Missions in other lands, recognized that a body such as itself, so large in membership, so changing in personnel, and meeting so seldom, could not possibly direct a work calling for a minute knowledge of special details, involving conditions foreign to the experience of men engaged in other affairs, and requiring the collection and expenditure of large funds, created a Board to do this work for it, retaining to itself the right of review and control so that the Board should not become independent of the body that created it. There is therefore no similarity in the relation of a missionary to his station and that of a self-developed congregation to its Session; nor does this similarity appear in the relationship between any of the other bodies in the series of judicatories referred to. Every missionary is on the foreign field not because of a call or election by a local congregation or station or mission, but solely because of appointment by the Board.

Not only are the relationships in one series different from those of the other because of an entirely different method of development but also because of an entirely different financial status. The development upward of Congregation, Session, Presbytery and General Assembly, is a natural and democratic one, for the constitution of the highest court is dependent upon the will of the lowest and original courts. The financial status, too, is an entirely democratic one. The local bodies at home not only determine the constitution and personnel of their higher courts but they support their own work and give their own share to the support of the higher courts which they have established. In the case of Foreign Missions, the Board acting as the authorized agency of the General Assembly, established Missions, appointed the missionaries, determined their support, provided it, and still provides not only that but most of the funds used in their work, from monies given to the Board by persons in the home Church and outside of the Mission. In the church organization, the congregation is the foundation of authority and the source of supply of all the funds of the higher courts. In the foreign missionary organization, the exact opposite is the case. On what basis then does the "Brief" of Dr. Adams make the missionary the corresponding unit to the congregation and so on up the series? He declares an identity which does not exist, which from the nature of the case cannot exist and upon this illusory foundation he builds his argument that the Mission, or third in his series, should have the authority which in the other series is exercised by the congregation or first in the series.

It is a grave misuse of language to call this system "autocratic," "a benevolent imperialism." The "system" which the Brief arraigns is thoroughly Presbyterian and democratic in that the highest judicatory of the Church is conducting in foreign lands a work in behalf of the whole Church in the only way that such a work can be efficiently carried on. The American system of government is admittedly democratic, but the democratic principle does not imply that the agents of the Government, sent abroad to do the work for which the Government is responsible, should have independent power to determine their own policies or the objects for which they will expend the funds sent them by the home Government. The authority of the United States Government is autocratic in many directions especially in its relation to its representatives abroad. It is sufficient that the democratic principle be observed in the selecting of the Government, and that then the Government do certain things for which it is responsible not to its representatives abroad but to its home constituency which created it.

Any proposal to deal with the relations of the General Assembly agency to its Foreign Missions by altering the form of government or organic law of the Church will probably be futile. It may be doubted whether any constitutional change could be made that would meet the problem. There are many who believe that organized Missions cannot be written into the Presbyterian Form of Government. A Mission is an extra ecclesiastical device, temporary in its nature, designated to accomplish certain ends for which thus far it has seemed to be the most useful instrumentality; but it does not fit into a Presbyterian Constitution. It is made up of men and women, it is not a church judicatory, it is dependent in personnel and money upon outside support, and

it has necessary limitations which are in conflict with principles of Presbyterian parity. Furthermore any constitutional enactment would have to embody universal principles and be stated in absolute terms. It could not provide one form of organization for Chosen, another for Guatemala, another for Alaska, and another for Idaho. It is doubtful whether any such regulations are possible. Moreover, under the missionary conditions which have grown up through the establishment of independent churches of which in fields like Chosen, the missionaries are members, the proposal of the Chosen Mission involves matters which lie beyond the jurisdiction of the Assembly. The Mission is not a Presbytery or a judicatory of any kind. No constitutional change can provide for a situation that is wholly without the constitution and that cannot be brought within the constitution. Even if some method could be devised by which the matters could be handled constitutionally, experience has indicated that it would be a long and difficult process with many unforeseeable pitfalls along the way. Whatever is to be done should be done by adjustment between the Board and the Missions.

Fourth: The proposal ignores the fact that the Board gives the Missions wide liberty of judgment and action. We object very decidedly to the statement of Dr. Adams in his article in *The Presbyterian*, that the Board controls the work down to "the minutest detail of field operations" and that foreign missionaries are "simply employees". On the contrary it has long been the practice of the Board to leave to the organized body of missionaries on the field the largest degree of freedom in managing their work that is compatible with efficiency and the responsibility which the General Assembly requires the Board to assume. In dealing with the Minutes and proceedings of a Mission it is the custom of the Secretaries to bring to the Board only those actions which involve trust obligations in financial matters, or the duty of the Board to safeguard the interests of all the Missions by dealing equitably between missionaries in various lands, or the necessity of maintaining a policy of missionary work which represents the judgment of the missionary body as a whole as well as that of the General Assembly. Mission actions which do not involve the Board's responsibilities are not presented to the Board at all, but are left to the discretion of the Mission. Of the actions which do require Board action, the assumption is always in favor of the Mission's request. Many a time the Secretaries have asked the Board to confirm requests of a Mission which did not commend themselves to their personal judgment and which, if they had been members of the Mission, they would not have voted for. Nevertheless, they did not concern the financial or other responsibilities of the Board, and therefore we felt that the judgment of the Mission should prevail. When the Board objects to a Mission action, it is almost invariably because the request calls for money which the Board does not feel able to provide, or because it involves a principle of fair dealing between Missions, or a fundamental question of missionary policy on which the Board knows that the general consensus of missionary opinion and the lessons of experience of missionary work in many fields point to a different conclusion. Even then, the Board seldom interferes unless circumstances compel it to do so. For example, when a majority in the Chosen Mission insisted that schools and colleges in that field should be limited to the children of members of the Church, the Board did not interfere and took no action on the subject until the missionaries of six denominations, including our own, asked their respective Boards to pass upon the proposal to form a union college and differed among themselves on this among other details. Then the Board simply decided in favor of the educational policy explicitly approved by the General Assembly and in operation in all the other Missions of our Church.

In Dr. Brown's second tour of the Missions in Asia, he presented the question of field organization to all the Missions that he visited in China, Japan and Chosen, and in his report to the Board after his return he discussed the subject at length. He urged that each Mission which did not have an Executive Committee should appoint one, that Missions which did have Executive Committees should increase their powers, and that where, as in China, there are several Missions in one country, they should unite in constituting a China Council composed of representatives elected by the cooperating Missions. This plan has been adopted and is in successful operation. The following paragraph from the Eightieth Annual Report of the Board in 1917 is historically accurate:

"The Board has continued to study the problem of how to secure larger and more efficient local administration on the various mission fields. Its policy has been to encourage the largest amount of democratic self-government in the Missions; but it is difficult to develop plans which will provide continuous and effective administration where missionaries are scattered in separate stations, where each individual is already overburdened with his own work and where the necessity of periodic furloughs interrupts continuity. The development of field executive committees, however, with chairmen or secretaries giving their entire time to the service of all the field work in the field concerned, has worked most successfully. The China and India Councils

are Executive Committees of all the Missions in those fields, and the great benefit of their work and of the entire devotion of the time of Dr. Lowrie in China and Dr. Griswold in India to the work of the Councils has been most advantageous."

The practical difficulty in making this policy more effectively operative is not due to the Board but to the fact that the Missions quite naturally want to spend more money than the Board can provide. At the beginning of each fiscal year the Board distributes among the various Missions the largest sum, within the limits fixed by the Executive Commission of the General Assembly, which there appears to be any reasonable probability of becoming available. This money is not in hand, but the Board nevertheless guarantees it to the Missions. It was formerly the custom for the Secretaries to go over the itemized estimates from the field and, as they were always in excess of the amount that could be appropriated, to reduce or cut out enough items to bring the amount down to the level of the budget; so much being taken away from this school, so much from the salary of this native evangelist, etc. The Board abandoned that plan long ago and adopted the one now in operation of assigning to each Mission a lump sum for its work and giving the Mission large discretion in using it. Of course the Missions still send their itemized estimates as it is important that the Board should know what work is being conducted. These estimates always call for a larger sum than the Board and Executive Commission deem practicable; but the Board now simply says to a Mission: "Of the amount you ask, the Board guarantees \$..... (specifying the sum) and you may use it as you see fit, making such transfers and readjustments as your wisdom may approve." We believe that this is the right method, as the missionaries are in a position to know where local adjustments can be made to the best advantage.

Now, if the Chosen Mission would take the amount of money thus assigned to it - and more has been sent to Chosen than to any other Mission in the world - if, we say, the Mission would conduct its work with this fund, there would be little necessity for the Board to take further actions. But the Mission, like the others, pours upon the Board throughout the year requests for additional appropriations. The Board meets regularly twice a month and there is seldom a meeting which does not have such requests on its docket, sometimes dozens of them from various fields. As a rule, when the Board declines a request from a Mission, it is because the request calls for more money than the board is able to provide. A request to authorize an appeal to the home churches of course is in the same category, for when the Executive Commission and the Board have agreed upon the presentation to the church of the largest practicable budget, care must be exercised not to blanket it by too many appeals for extras. The Board gladly authorizes as many special appeals as it deems prudent, but the number must be carefully guarded.

An analysis of the actions of the Board relating to the Chosen Mission for the two fiscal years from April 1st, 1915 to March 31st, 1917, shows that during that period the Board took 159 actions regarding Chosen, including seventeen appointments of new missionaries and many appropriations of special gifts, and that of the whole number of 159 only three were declinations of Mission requests. At the conference, June 18th, with four members of the Mission who were then at home on furlough, one of them, Mr. Rhodes, said that "the Board almost always did what the Mission wanted, and that it had done this so long and so regularly that when it did exercise its power in negating a Mission action, the Mission experienced the shock of the unusual." Another missionary present, Dr. Adams, endorsed this and added: "The Board has practically allowed the Mission to do what it wanted. The only exceptions I remember in my missionary experience of twenty-three years are in the Fusan and Seoul College matters, and the former was finally settled as the Mission desired." The Brief (page 6) admits that "In ordinary current operations, large discretion is left with the field organizations in almost every line; and even when there may be minor divergences of judgment, not infrequently the judgment of the field body is allowed to stand." The Brief adds that this "does not affect the principle of the system." We think it does. A system which works so much to the satisfaction of the Missions as these figures and admissions indicate can hardly be considered arbitrary or exercised without due regard to their wishes.

The "Petition to the Board," adopted by the Mission in 1915 and quoted in the Brief of Dr. Adams, states that the Mission desired final authority in field matters only." We reply that if the phrase "field matters" be properly defined the Mission already has such authority. But where opinions differ, who is to be the judge whether a given question is a field question or a Board question? In a work like Foreign Missions, it is not easy to draw a clear line of demarcation and to say that everything on one side is a "field question" and everything on the other side is a "Board question." It is significant that the "Petition" enumerated the following as "field questions":

"1. The location and assignment of all missionaries commissioned by the Board to work within the bounds of the Mission.

"2. The return from the field of workers whom the corporate Mission does not consider suitable for the work.

"3. The powers to be exercised by field committees working within the bounds of the Mission.

"4. The superintendence and control of all existing field institutions.

"5. The initiatory in new institutions subject to Board vote as to actual step, as to number, character and location.

"6. The principles of self-support in the native Church as related to Mission operations.

"7. Union or federation upon the field in work with the Missions of other denominations.

"8. The relation of the Mission and its members to the Korean Church."

The fact is that the Board now recognizes all of these as "field questions," and that the Mission has been exercising and is now exercising unchallenged freedom in dealing with them as such, except when a particular question has assumed a form which involved the responsibilities of the Board as the agency of the General Assembly and the home Church. It is significant of the Mission's meaning that the protests of the majority of the Mission against the action of the Board in the case of the Union Christian College at Seoul attached essential importance to their belief that "this is a field question" and held that the Board had no "moral right" to a decision on it other than to ratify the vote of a majority of the missionaries. In its reminder of July 8, 1914, the Board said on this point: "The project now under consideration is far from being merely a 'field question.' It involves the Board in responsibilities for the expenditure of large sums of money, the appointment and support of missionaries, relations with other Boards, and a variety of other responsibilities which are inseparable from the discharge of the duty which the Church has committed to the Board. The Mission itself tacitly recognizes this when it says that 'all it (the Pyeng Yang College needs is more encouragement from the New York end' and 'a stronger support.' The kind of 'encouragement' and 'support' needed is evidenced by the Mission's call upon the Board at its last annual meeting for another professor in addition to the four already maintained and for Yen 260,000 for new property and endowment. In these circumstances the Board is obliged to consider whether it can assume the financial and other burdens incident to the maintenance of a College in Korea, except as these burdens be shared by the other Boards which form the union. The Board confidently expects that the missionaries will recognize the reasonableness of its position and that they will not cherish the feeling that the Board does not 'trust their judgment' because, after full consultation with them and careful consideration of their views, it feels bound by its sense of duty as an administrator of trust funds to express a conclusion as to the financial and other burdens that it can properly assume."

In like manner, the contention of the Mission that the Board overruled it on the College matter requires modification. The Board's reply to the Mission in the letter of July 8, 1914, stated on this point: "The protesting missionaries apparently overlook the fact that the Board is not dealing solely with a majority and minority of our own Mission. The Board and the Mission having agreed to enter into a union on the initiative of the missionaries themselves, the Board is now dealing with five other Boards at the home base and with the whole body of missionaries in six Missions in Korea. It is true that if missionaries alone are counted, the majority for Pyeng Yang is a majority of the whole body of missionaries. But the Board must consider the parties both at home and on the field whose responsibilities are involved. Of the six Missions in Korea, the vote of 1912 was three Missions for Pyeng Yang and three for Seoul. The vote of 1913 was three for Pyeng Yang, two for Seoul, and the vote of the sixth Mission was a tie. The vote of the Senate of the Educational Foundation in Korea in 1912 was a tie and after the votes of absent members were obtained, the poll stood seven for Pyeng Yang to six for Seoul. Of the six Boards, all five of those in North America voted for Seoul. While it is true that the numerical preponderance of our own Mission has given a majority for Pyeng Yang in the polls of individual missionaries, these other facts may be fairly taken into consideration in arriving at a balanced judgment. The Board must be governed by a broad view of the entire situation as developed in joint study of the whole situation in conference with all the parties concerned.

In 1917, a Mission in China voted to withdraw from two union institutions which had been formed three years before by the concurrent action of that Mission and the China Council and the ratification of the Board. Property had been secured and obligations entered into affecting our relations with the Missions and Boards of other denominations. Would it be right to vest in the majority of a local Mission in any given year final power to

disrupt work of that kind? What security could any enterprise have in such circumstances, and what assurance would the Boards of other denominations have that when they enter into a compact with us we would not treat it as "a scrap of paper"? Manifestly, there should be a body which represents the communion as a whole in which authority should be lodged subject only to the ultimate power of the General Assembly.

Section 2 of the Brief states that, whereas the field organization governing the individual missionary, the station, and the Mission "may be said to be framed on a consistent Presbyterian basis," "the system is abruptly broken in the relation of field and home base"; "that the system in its field organization is Presbyterian and democratic, but in its connection between field and home base it becomes as distinctly autocratic." This is an amazing statement whose underlying fallacy we have already shown. As a matter of fact, there are persons who feel that the Chosen Mission has been more autocratic in its dealings with its stations and individual missionaries than the Board has ever been in its dealings with the Mission. It is an utter travesty upon the real facts of the situation to characterize the Chosen Mission as Presbyterian and democratic in its relation to its stations and missionaries, and the Board as "autocratic" and "imperial" in its relation to the Mission. It raises a false issue to call the question one of Democracy versus Autocracy. It is really the simple question whether a democracy can conduct Foreign Missionary work efficiently. The Brief states that "this is not a criticism of the Board" but of "a system" and that "the authority is the General Assembly and the system its system." In view of the generous and sympathetic attitude of the General Assembly year after year, a course which it has gladly taken in its efforts to cooperate with the missionaries and to provide everything possible for them, and in view of the fact that the very strength which the Chosen Mission now advances as a reason for virtual independence was due in part at least to the successful working out of "the system" referred to, it is most unfortunate that such a groundless and unjust charge should be made.

The substitute now proposed by the Executive Committee of the Mission suggests the incorporation in the Board's Manual of the following sentence: "It (the Mission) cannot inaugurate policies without the consent of the Board, and the Board does not do so in the field without the concurrence of the Mission." Passing over for the present the consideration that we are not advised that this substitute has been adopted by the Mission, the point now to be noted is in the phrase "without the concurrence of the Mission." What is it that the Board is not to do without the concurrence of the Mission? The preceding clause informs us that it is to "inaugurate or conduct work or inaugurate policies." In other words, the Board cannot do anything "without the concurrence of the Mission." The history of the agitation conclusively shows that this is precisely what is intended - namely, to deprive the Board of its present powers as the administrative agency of the General Assembly and to make the Mission the final authority. The agency constituted by the General Assembly, and amenable to it alone could not "conduct the work" with which the Assembly has charged it "without the concurrence of the Mission." In other words, each of the twenty-seven Missions would have the power of veto upon work which the General Assembly orders the Board to do! Demoralization of the work would inevitably result.

The Brief says (page 9) that "the point I (Dr. Adams) am pressing is nothing more than the most fundamental principles of Presbyterianism." It impresses us as pure Congregationalism and that, too, in the most extreme form. That is to say, it demands the ultimate supremacy of the local unit against the ultimate supremacy of the body which represents the whole Church. Congregationalism stands for consultation of the local body with other bodies with a view to their advice, but for the right of the local body to do as it chooses after having secured that advice. The proposal is not Presbyterian. It is ultra-independency. No Congregational Board has ever thought of going so far. On the contrary, the American Board has always exercised a far greater measure of control and direction over its Missions than the Presbyterian Board has done, and although administratively the American Episcopal Church and the S.P.G. of the Church of England have absolved themselves of responsibility and located it upon the field, it has not been vested in the Missions but lodged almost absolutely in the Bishops of the home Church. We know of no communion which lodges such power in its Missions as the petition proposes. All of the great communions lodge final authority either in the supreme judicatory of the home Churches and the Boards which they create and which are responsible to them, or they vest it in the duly constituted churches on the field.

The proposal would remove from the missionary Board all direct and administrative touch with the Mission work. It would reduce it to an agency for the appointment of new missionaries, and the collection and allotment of lump sums to the various missions of financial contributions. Such an arrangement is impossible and undesirable. It is impossible because by the very nature of the work, the responsibilities of a Board of

Trustees cannot be reduced to such elements. Problems of governmental relationships, of interdenominational interests and institutions, of the responsible representation of the work on the field to the churches at home, of the honest and legal discharge of financial trusts, of broad missionary policy, and of the world's occupation and evangelization, arise and simply cannot be evaded and they will forbid any Board from becoming the administrative nullity proposed. Such an arrangement is not only impracticable, it is undesirable. What is needed in the missionary work, and in all great activities of the Kingdom of God, is not less but more central administrative judgment and energy. It is desirable to enlarge the responsibilities of boards and committees both on the field and at home in order to secure more life and thought from the best men. It would be suicidal for the work of Foreign Missions to deprive itself of the kind of support and guidance which is received from the type of men who have served on missionary boards and whose interest and initiative should be conserved and enlarged, not distrusted and annulled. Presbyterian Foreign Missions will certainly forfeit the high place they now hold in the religious world if, in the face of every rational Christian principle of efficiency, they disintegrate into a scattered congeries of loose and ineffective local autonomies.

In describing on page 8 the great work conducted by the Chosen Mission, the Brief mentions the fact that "its annual budget runs into the hundreds of thousands of dollars." The Brief significantly fails to state that this great sum is provided by the Board which is responsible for securing it from the home Church. Is it to be assumed that the Board as the representative of the donors can secure such a budget if the proposed arrangement shall be put into effect and is it reasonable to expect the Board to carry such a financial responsibility if it is to have no [more] power in administering the money than the amendment would leave it? It was the Board that founded the Mission, and the Board that has favored it in reinforcements, and property and budget. With the kind of a Board which the adoption of the proposed amendment would make, the work of the Chosen Mission would never have been developed.

The proposal overlooks the fact that to deprive the Board of its present power would lessen even if it did not destroy the power of the Board to do the many constructive things that it has been doing and that are vital to the wise and effective discharge of the foreign missionary duty of the Church. So far from the growth of the missionary enterprise obviating the necessity for a central administrative board, it does just the opposite. Present world conditions imperatively demand a larger and more effective unification and coordination of all missionary activities so that our force and money can be used to better advantage in this extraordinary period of race upheaval and opportunity. Never has a strong Board, with the full power that the General Assembly has committed to it, been more urgently needed than now.

It is questionable whether the supporters of Foreign Missions themselves would be satisfied with the kind of Board that would result from the adoption of the proposed plan. Could busy men, accustomed to dealing with large affairs, be induced to give their valuable time to an agency which would be shorn of real responsibility and the power to do much of anything but collect and forward funds which it had no power to administer? An experienced missionary, after reading the Chosen action and the Brief of Dr. Adams, saw this point with concern and wrote:

"What would be the type of Board Secretary who would consent to occupy the position of a simple collector of funds to be transferred by him to the Missions to be used at their discretion? And how many business men would continue to give such sums as they now give to be sent to unknown members of Missions for their unrestricted use?"

Under the present "system" to which the Brief objects, the Chosen Mission has had the backing of a Board which, with all its defects, has nevertheless been capable enough to provide and send to the field the men and women and money and equipment that were indispensable to the success of which the Board now speaks. Is the Mission sure of its ability to maintain its scale of operations if it has no other organized backing in America than the weakened kind of a Board which the adoption of the proposed amendment would render inevitable? The money which affords the financial foundation for the work of the Mission is not money which the Mission itself has obtained, but money that the Board has assigned to it. It is true that some gifts have been obtained by members of the Mission, but they have formed but a small proportion of the annual expenditure and, with very few exceptions, the donors have given them not to the missionaries as individuals but to them as regularly appointed missionaries by the Board. Making all due allowance for the liberality of some gifts that have been purely personal, the general fact remains that the Chosen Mission could not possibly have done what it has done if it had not been for the Board's generous exercise of the power that the present system lodges in its hands and

which the proposed amendment would weaken if indeed it would not destroy. It is true that the proposed amendment states that the Board shall have the "power of review and control"; but the clear purport of the amendment is to deprive the Board of the right of initiative, "conduct" and "superintendence" vested in it by the General Assembly. The term "review and control" is a vague one and susceptible of wide differences of interpretation. If it is compatible with the ruling of the General Assembly in constituting the Board, it means nothing more than we have now. If it is not compatible with that ruling as it is plainly not intended to be, it is contrary to the decisions of the General Assembly and the fundamental principles which underlie the General Assembly's responsibility for and relations to the foreign missionary work of the Church. The present proposal nominally recognizes the supervision power of the General Assembly, but if the Assembly were to attempt to exercise it, the same issue which has arisen now between the Chosen Mission and the Board would undoubtedly arise between the Mission and the General Assembly. There is no ground for believing that a Mission which disapproves of the limiting authority of the Home Church, expressed through the Board would be satisfied with it if expressed through the General Assembly; and the arguments which the Chosen Mission has used in the petition presented two years ago are more valid against any control of the Mission by the General Assembly than against control by the Board. If the Mission will not acquiesce in a decision by twenty-six members and officers of an agency appointed by the General Assembly for such purposes and qualified by many years of experience in dealing with Mission matters, what ground is there for the assumption that the Mission would acquiesce in a decision by another Committee consisting of twenty-one men hastily appointed after the General Assembly convenes, a majority of whom have had no experience in foreign missionary administration and who can hold only a few hurried meetings before the Assembly adjourns? If the majority of the Chosen Mission do not desire virtual independence from the control of any agency of the Home Church, they have certainly pursued a course which naturally suggests such an interpretation.

The proposal would transfer an undue proportion of the superintendence and control of the foreign missionary enterprise to the field agencies which, from the very nature and limitations of their organization and membership, would be seriously hampered in effectively exercising it. An experienced member of another Mission has written:

"In the nature of the case, perhaps there is no circle in the world, except a family circle, in which its members need to guard one another's susceptibilities so carefully as the foreign missionary circle. The fewness, the intimacy, the parity, the isolation, the conspicuousness, the indispensable harmony, all conspire to make this so. It follows that delicate subjects affecting personal and local interests are nowhere in the world so difficult to handle as in the mission circle. And it is often necessary, in the interest of internal harmony, to neglect or postpone important measures. Hence, in dealing with such questions the Board must often need to take the initiative, and to follow up if necessary with no little pressure, to counteract the personal forces at work, and get beyond the compromises into which these are apt to lead and into the region of the independent and impartial judgment of the mission as a whole."

The Chosen Mission affords many painful illustrations of this. It is well known that the Mission's attitude toward a number of important matters has been so influenced by considerations of the kind referred to in the above quotation that it was impossible to secure an unbiased vote on their real merit. Nor is the Chosen Mission alone in this. Dr. Speer, after an experience of twenty-five years in dealing with Missions, says: "A Mission is a body incapable of efficiently discharging such functions and powers as the Chosen Mission proposes to give it. We have not been able as yet in our Presbyterian system to devise any better way of conducting the work than by Missions, but from the point of view of satisfactory administrative efficiency the Mission is an utterly inadequate agency. It is an annual conference of busy individuals. Its committees seldom meet. In only a few Missions are there effective executive committees, and in not one Mission of the Church, are there such committees sufficiently effective to justify the Church or any trustee acting in its name, to locate full power in them. The Board undoubtedly is inadequately effective, but it is the most effective agency in the whole missionary mechanism; and to a scrupulous and conscientious man who applies to the administration of work and of money the conditions which are required of trustees in America, the proposal to make the Missions the authoritative and final agencies of Missionary administration is impossible. With all kindness to the Chosen Mission it must be said about that Mission also that it is not adequately efficient to justify such an absolute transfer of power to it as is proposed. There is much efficiency in the Missions, but it is the efficiency of individual missionaries, good and devoted men and women. It is not the efficiency of missions as organizations.

There are, moreover, many problems connected with mission work which Missions, cannot settle upon the field, such as problems of furloughs, of resignations, of personal difficulties, of personal character and efficiency, sometimes also of morals, which again and again it has been shown only a distinct and personal authority can deal with."

Sixth: The proposal, if adopted, would seriously lessen the ability of the Board to secure gifts not only from congregations but from individual donors who are now giving in increasing numbers and enlarging amounts. The Board would be virtually compelled to say to donors: "We will transmit your money to the field, but we cannot assume the responsibility for its wise expenditure, for if the Mission should differ with the Board as to the proper use of the money, the decision of the Mission would be final." It is easy to see how the Mission and its work might suffer under such a plan. Business men will not entrust large gifts to a body which cannot be held to accountability for administration of the trust. The Board is a responsible, legally incorporated agency amenable both to the civil and ecclesiastical courts for the use of the trust funds that are committed to it. It is located, too, in America where the donors know it, and have the means at their disposal for bringing it to task if necessity should arise. It is not reasonable to assume that donors would be disposed to make such gifts to widely scattered bodies in distant lands which are not incorporated and therefore cannot be held to legal accountability; which are unknown to both ecclesiastical and civil law, and which are not designed to be permanent bodies at all but to exist only until the churches in the mission field are prepared to take over their duties.

The proposal would weaken the sense of responsibility of the home Church and of individual donors for the maintenance of the foreign missionary enterprise. The position of the Presbyterian Church is that Foreign Missions is the work of the Church itself, which should assume the fullest measure of responsibility for it. It is hard enough now to persuade the home churches to accept the necessary implications of their responsibility, and every effort should be put forth to emphasize them. Anything that would weaken this sense of responsibility, as the proposed amendment inevitably would, would be disastrous. The very last thing that missionaries ought to desire is independence from the direct supervision of the home Church through its constituted agency. The principle that men will not be interested in the conduct of an enterprise in which they do not have an authoritative voice applies to ministers and laymen in America as well as to missionaries on the foreign field. Dr. Adams says: "Authority cannot be separated from responsibility." If this be true, it is fatal to his own argument, for manifestly it is indispensable to the success of the missionary enterprise that the Church should assume responsibility for it, and according to the principle enunciated by Dr. Adams, authority necessarily goes with that responsibility and anything that would divest the Home Church of its authority would divest it also of its responsibility. February 15, 1855, President Francis Wayland, of the Baptist Missionary Society wrote on a question that was then pending regarding the relations of that Society to the missionaries under its care:

"It is to be decided whether the brethren who support missionaries are to have the direction of their labours, or to have no other duty than to pay the bills. It is claimed that the notions of Baptist independence require that on all these points missionaries be wholly untrammelled. I am willing to grant all that the missionaries can ask on this subject, but I must claim the same liberty for myself. I must be relieved from all obligation of supporting men on such conditions. I am bound as a Christian to see to it so far as I can that my contribution accomplishes the will of the Master, and if I and the missionary cannot agree on this point we must separate. I have a conscience as much as a missionary. If the missionaries are to be under no control and are to control the Board by appeals to the public, who will serve on the Board or the Committee or in the mission rooms? The whole arrangement is useless and erroneous, and the ----- are impossible. And really from what I have seen I must say that the missionaries who demand unlimited control have not shown the tempers which would give me the strongest confidence in their judgment."

It needs to be remembered further that the issue is not between the Mission and the Board only, but also between the Mission and the native churches in the Mission field. These churches have often argued, and in some fields are arguing now, against the control of mission funds and the administration of the work by the Missions on the very same grounds that the Chosen Mission argues against the control of the Board. A strong native Church asserts that it knows better than a Mission what the conditions are and needs of the work are, that it is far closer to the problems and the elements that enter into them than any body of foreigners can ever be, that the Mission funds were given for them and in response to appeals in their behalf, and were not given for the missionaries. Dr. Duff faced arguments like these in Calcutta many years ago, and they have been advanced in Chile, Mexico, Japan, Persia, and several other fields. Almost every argument that is used in behalf of the

transferring of all authority in Missionary administration from a Board to a strong Mission can be used also in behalf of its transfer from a Mission to a strong native church, and a Mission cannot meet these arguments by advancing its duty as a trustee without recognizing in doing so the trust responsibility and authority of the home Board. Indeed, the arguments in the Overture from Chosen are more valid for a strong native church against the Mission than for the Mission against the Board. Secretary John C. Lowrie maintained this view. In his papers on "Administrative Missions," he argued for a responsible missionary administration in the Board at home with as large a delegation of powers to the foreign field as possible, and in his papers on "Missionary Presbyteries" and "Missionary Presbyteries in the Home Church," he argued that the administration of Missions on the field should be lodged not in the Missions but in the Presbyteries. In many native churches the very arguments which the Chosen proposal uses in behalf of mission autonomy are pressed against the Mission, namely that "only men of long residence and participation in the work in any field can hope to fully understand its problems and difficulties - - - - The time has come when the Mission (Presbytery) should be given in its distinctive field (which the Chinese Church says is China and the Japanese Church, Japan) an authority commensurate with its responsibilities."

The proposal would imperil the fundamental object of the missionary enterprise (which is to establish a self-governing as well as self-propagating and self-supporting Church in the mission field) by strengthening field organizations which are not composed of ministers and elders of the native churches but of missionaries who are aliens under the laws of the countries in which they reside and who are not really amenable to the judicatories of the churches in the mission field. It is true that most of the forty ordained members of the Chosen Mission, about one-third of its membership, are technically members of the Presbyteries in Chosen; but most of them retain their membership in their respective Presbyteries in the United States, a dual relationship that is abnormal and temporary and is doubtful constitutionally under Presbyterian law. They consider themselves American citizens and Presbyterians, and they claim full recognition and rights as such before the American Government and the American Church, as their present request to the Executive Commission of the General Assembly significantly shows. It is fundamental to Presbyterianism and to any proper interpretation of the Scriptures that the Church should govern itself and not be controlled by resident bodies of aliens organized separately from the Church and yet sustaining such relations to it and so largely controlling the funds that are necessary to its work as to give them practical overlordship. Such alien domination is of the essence of Roman Catholicism; but it is not Protestant, least of all is it Presbyterian. As we have already intimated, the Missions came into existence simply as temporary expedients during the early stages of the work when there were no churches in the mission field and no material out of which they could be organized. The local supervision of the work and the expenditure of missionary money were therefore necessarily invested in the Missions. It has never been contemplated by the Board or by wise missionary administrators anywhere that the Mission should be a permanent body. On the contrary, it is one of the axioms of sound missionary policy that the Mission is a temporary body whose existence can be justified only as long as there is no Church which can supervise the work within its bounds. Our Presbyterian methods of missionary administration look directly to the ultimate organization of Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies on the foreign field. The Board gladly looks forward to the time when the General Assembly, through the Board as its agency, can transfer a large measure of responsibility in our present fields to the duly constituted judicatories of the churches in those fields, so that the Board can develop other fields in the regions beyond. In Dr. Brown's "Report on a Second Visit to China, Japan and Korea, in 1909," he called attention to the fact that "making all due allowance for modifying considerations," "the general fact remains that our policy in its practical operation has not sufficiently taken into account the development of the Native Church and the recognition of its rights and privileges. We have built up Missions, emphasized their authority and dignity, and kept them separate from the native Church, until, in some regions at least, the Mission has become such an independent centralized body, so entrenched in its station compounds, and with all power so absolutely in its hands, that the native Church feels helpless and irritated in its presence. The larger [the] reinforcements we send, the greater the danger becomes." In these circumstances, it is a serious question whether the time has not come to diminish rather than to increase the powers of the Mission. The proposed amendment to the Manual would be not only un-Presbyterian in principle and unbusiness-like in administration but it would be reactionary in its relation to the Church, since it would still further strengthen a tendency that is already too strong, to make the separately organized bodies of missionaries more permanent and authoritative than they are now. We are sure that it is the policy of the Chosen Mission to

devolve increasing responsibilities upon the Korean Church and we are not unmindful of gratifying evidences of this in certain lines of work; but it is futile to expect that the Korean Presbyteries and the Korean General Assembly ever will accomplish what Presbyteries and a General Assembly are supposed to accomplish as long as they must work under the overshadowing moral control of large, compact and powerful organizations of foreign missionaries with such enlarged authority as the proposed amendment would give. We should unhesitatingly recognize the fact that the present status of the Missions is somewhat anomalous and unsatisfactory both in its relations to the Board and to the Church in the Mission field. But the difficulty inheres in the situation and not in the policy of the Board.

We may add that some serious complications with Governments occasionally grow out of, or are intensified by, the ascendancy of the organized body of missionaries over the native Christians. This is notably true in Chosen where grave difficulties have developed, not because the Japanese Government is opposed to Christianity, but because it resents the ascendancy of large and powerful bodies of foreigners over its own subjects. Dr. Brown has explained this in some detail in a pamphlet on "The Korean Conspiracy Case" and in an article on "Japanese Nationalism and Mission Schools in Chosen" in *The International Review of Missions*, January, 1917. Careful study of the situation has led us to the conclusion that it would be highly unwise to increase the power of a Mission whose present power has become a source of anxiety from the double viewpoint of the best interests of the Korean Church and of needed adjustments with the Japanese Government.

It is well known that leading Christians in Asia are becoming restive, and in some places sharply resentful, under the ascendancy of the Mission. In many fields it is becoming more and more difficult to induce educated and capable native Christians to devote themselves to Christian work because of the subordination to foreigners which they regard it as involving. We are inclined to believe that the time has come when this situation should be directly faced. There has been a good deal of talk about it, but more specific action is needed. This action should be definitely in the direction of diminishing the powers of the Mission rather than increasing them. It should commit a larger measure of the control of the work to the Presbyteries within whose bounds it is conducted. The pending proposal is directly antagonistic to a fundamental principle of wise missionary administration as well as of proper ecclesiastical procedure. It proposes to intensify one of the greatest dangers now on the field, namely the undue predominance of the Mission as distinguished from the Church. It would make an uncomfortable situation still more uncomfortable, in that it would increase the power of the organized body of missionaries which is already too great for the best interests of the work. If the Mission were given the powers which it now asks, there would be the anomalous situation of two bodies (Mission and Presbytery) exercising Presbyterian authority in the same field. The conflicts that would result can be easily imagined.

Section 4 of the "Brief" bases an argument for greater power for the Chosen Mission on its large size. Secretaries who have for many years conducted the Board's administrative correspondence with the twenty-seven Missions, including Chosen, have seen no reason to conclude that there is any necessary causal relation between size and wisdom. If mere numbers are to be determinative, just where shall the mathematical line be drawn between the number that should be given autonomy and the number that should not have it? Shall we say that forty-nine or ninety-nine missionaries ought to be dependent and fifty or one hundred independent? The fact is that some of the most efficiently conducted Missions do not have half the membership of the Chosen Mission. Our knowledge of the home Church and of the Missions on the foreign field does not permit us to acquiesce in the assertion at the bottom of page 8 of the "Brief" that "outside of the Boards there is possibly nothing in the home Church that parallels it (the Chosen Mission) as a large, efficient operating organization." As a matter of fact, the files of the Board contain unpleasant proof of the statement that, with the exception of only one Mission and that a very small one, the Chosen Mission's handling of important missionary matters has been more sadly influenced by personal controversies between missionaries than in any other of our twenty-seven Missions.

The proposal, if adopted, would jeopardize the rights of minorities in the Missions and place them at the mercy of local majorities. Several missionaries to whom the proposed amendment has been shown have seriously objected to it on this account. So far from affording added protection to missionaries against arbitrary exercise of authority, the amendment would greatly diminish the protection that they now have in the Board with the powers which the General Assembly has vested in it. The proposed plan gives no protection to mission minorities or to small stations as against the big ones, which often absolutely control in the counsels and policies

of a Mission. The very troubles which have arisen in Chosen illustrate this consideration. It happens that every case of difficulty between the Board and the Mission has really been due to the fact that in matters which have come before the Board, the judgment of the Board coincided with that of the minority in the Mission rather than with that of the majority.. The proposal which has been made would take away all such power from the Board and would deliver in each autonomous Mission the interests of the minority of the Mission, and of every individual in it absolutely into the control of the majority of the voting members. So strongly do some of the members of the Mission feel on this subject that they have not only protested against the suggested amendment but they have declared that "if such an action as this 'Brief' becomes a law," they "will ask that the Board give us permission to form a separate Mission" as our position would be intolerable." Two members of another station have written:

"The minority can be content to express its convictions and be kept off the important committees of the Mission if it feels that it has fair play and knows there is a tribunal to which it can justly make its appeal. But to be compelled to submit with hands tied and mouth gagged, i.e., with no possibility of winning a case except it appeal to the supreme court (the General Assembly) would be to impose conditions under which missionaries should not be asked to work. Under the present rules and by-laws, it is almost impossible for the minority to be represented on the Executive Committee, and it is very seldom that it has been represented. . . . The Mission needs the wider vision of the Board. At times it may be necessary for the Board to decide contrary to the wishes of the Mission in matters pertaining to union movements, relation to the Government, relation of the missionaries to the native church, etc. These are matters on which there is a fairly well defined mission science which should not be set aside because a group of missionaries in a particular field are so occupied with the problems immediately at hand that they cannot see from the historical mountain tops of missions."

A member of a third station writes: "If this amendment is adopted, the minority would be almost defenseless, for it would have great difficulty in using its right to appeal to the General Assembly - even more so than the entire Mission has now when it feels that it must take something to the Assembly over the head of the Board. The minority's position is difficult enough as it is." Would the best young men in our home colleges and universities be disposed to apply for appointment with a Board which could afford them no protection from a chance majority in a local Mission, where, as many painful instances show, decisions regarding a fellow worker are not always free from personal feelings?

An experienced missionary has recently said that "few missionaries would be willing to submit themselves even at the beginning of their career to the full control of a body of men on the field of whom they know nothing, and fewer still would be ready to submit themselves to such control after they do know them, not because they are better than their colleagues but because they are but there at their call, not at their selection, not even at their expense, but at the call of God and the direct selection of the Board which also supports them." Some of the ablest and most valued missionaries of the whole Presbyterian Church, men of international reputation, would have been forced out of Chosen long ago if the majority in the Mission had possessed the powers which it now claims.

The proposal is influenced by the fact that the majority of the Mission has seriously objected to a decision of the Board in the specific instance of the Chosen Christian College at Seoul and by the further fact that the Mission assumed that it had no means of redress in that case and no protection from future decisions, except to deprive the Board of the power to overrule a Mission. Indeed several members of the Mission have frankly admitted that the Mission would never have raised the issue of the Board's power if it had not been for the fact that the Board decided adversely to the wishes of a majority of our Mission in this single case, which was the culmination of long standing friction between the missionaries themselves, existing prior to and independently of the course of the Board. "The whole question grows out of the Seoul College," a member of the majority declared in the conference in New York. The Board's judgment, however, was in harmony with the judgment of all the other denominational Boards in North America that have work in Chosen and with that of a large minority in the whole missionary body; for the question related to a union institution and not to our work alone. An overwhelming majority in our own Mission as well as in the other Missions voted for one union college instead of two colleges but divided on the question of location. In concurring with the other Boards for Seoul, our Board simply acted under its clear duty of "review and control" in a controversy which originated on the field and which came before the Board in orderly course in the minutes of the proceedings of the field bodies. The differences not merely between members of our Mission but between six Missions of as many

denominations had reached an impasse which compelled action by the cooperating Boards at home, our Board being only one of the five Boards in North America that were concerned. Manifestly no mechanical adjustment of the relations of one Board to its own Denominational Mission can cover a situation of that kind, especially when, as notoriously in this case, the issue was complicated to a large degree by personal and local feelings in Chosen which obscured to some extent the real merits of the question. The most that can be said against the Board is that, in passing upon a matter that came to it from the field, it made an error of judgment. If it did, that error does not justify an attempt to change the fundamental relation of the General Assembly to its missionary work in all lands and to amend the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church. The error should have been dealt with as error, in accordance with the orderly and recognized method of an appeal to the General Assembly in that particular case. If the Board, as the centralized agency constituted by the General Assembly for this purpose, makes a wrong decision in a particular instance, as it undoubtedly has done more than once, and will doubtless do again in the future, the Mission concerned has the right of appeal to the General Assembly if it deems a given question important enough to justify such appeal. Any organization composed of human beings may make errors of judgment, but Presbyterian methods of administration provide an orderly way to deal with such errors by appeal to the body which created the Board and which has power to affirm, modify or reverse its decisions. If a court has made only two "wrong judgments" in twenty-three years," as Dr. Adams states, surely the remedy of the aggrieved party is to lodge an appeal to the supreme judiciary in that particular case, and not to attempt to deprive the court of the power to render any decision at all.

As a matter of fact, the change proposed by the Chosen Mission would not lessen in the least the liability to error. It would merely transfer it from the Board to the Mission. A missionary has truly said that "you cannot avoid mistakes by shifting authority from the Board to the Mission; you simply prevent the rectification of a mistake when it is made."

Most of the Missions, if not all of them excepting Chosen, appear to be satisfied with the general system and policy as it has been developed. Many of them have wanted the Board to assume more and not less authority. The support which it has given to the Missions and the administrative assistance which they have received from it have vastly exceeded any restraint that it has laid upon them. A prominent member of the Japan Mission wrote to Mr. Speer:

"As to Mission autonomy; I have heard indirectly of the agitation of the Korea Mission. I think possibly Dr. ----- may have written to some in our Mission. However I know of no general feeling prevalent in the Japan Mission on the subject. Some may entertain such ideas, but if so they have not been publicly expressed. At the meeting of the Executive Committee I read this part of your letter and asked the judgment of the members as to the question raised. No one indicated dissatisfaction with the relations in general that now exist between the Mission and the Board. Under Section 40 of the Manual, I think the Mission understands autonomy has been conferred upon it as regards the conduct of the work in its territory. The Mission prizes the fullest liberty in administering the funds entrusted to it, and in initiating and controlling enterprises carried on within the appropriations received from the Board, and in this respect I think we have had little cause to complain of interference from the Board in recent years. I do not think our Board as it is organized could conduct a successful work in any other way, and in this regard we are more happily situated than some other Missions whose Boards confer less autonomy on the field forces."

A widely-known India missionary, to whom the Chosen action was shown without any comment except a simple request for his opinion, replied as follows:

"I do not feel that the authority vested in the Board has ever been used to the detriment of the work on the field either in the matter of policy or administration, certainly not in any really important question that I can recall during my twenty-eight years of service. On the other hand I believe that the authority increasingly extended to the Missions has been both liberal and wise . . . The collective judgment of a Board, constituted as ours is, is of inestimable value on questions of administration and I cannot clearly see how a Mission responsible directly to the Assembly and subject to a 'Board' or 'Agent' under the Assembly would materially differ from the present organization. The 'Board' or 'Agent' under the Assembly would necessarily have to consist of a number of men experienced in Mission administration with all the complex questions that are involved in matters of finance, recruiting, missionary education and propaganda; and just in what particulars that Board or Agent would differ from the Board as at present constituted, I am unable to determine. Certainly in India with our Missions under their existing constitutions, in addition to the interdenominational Provincial and National

Councils to which the Board may refer for advice and suggestion in matters of policy, as indeed it has been free to do, I am unable to see either the desirability or necessity of the plan proposed by the Korea Mission."

Another prominent missionary writes:

"I doubt the wisdom of the Mission having more power than it has. I know it hurts when the Board steps on our toes. But I still feel that in spite of an occasional mistake on the part of the Board, the present form of procedure is safer. I know that I would rather trust my affairs to the present system with the double check than entirely to the control of the Mission. And I am convinced that the average business man of means - the man who is more and more going to finance our Mission work - would be inspired to give to the work more liberally under the present form than if the Mission had full control of its field affairs."

A protest against the proposed amendment signed by two members of the Mission closes with the following words:

"It should not be forgotten that in 99 cases out of 100, the Mission's decision in all field matters is concurred in by the Board. This whole question has come up because of the one hundredth case in which the Board exercises its authority. And in these exceptional cases it is usually better that authority does rest with the Board. When the missionaries are sharply divided and reach a decision, it is far better to forget our differences and abide by whatever decision the Board makes. When a problem delicate of solution arises in connection with the native Church, it may be a happy circumstance if we can say that the final decision rests not with ourselves. If ever strained relations arise between missionaries and government officials, it is very fortunate when we can say that we are working under a Board and a General Assembly, just as it is fortunate that as citizens of a great Republic we can interpose our country and our flag if need be. May we be preserved from thinking we are sufficient unto ourselves or from working under rules that will make us so!"

We feel, however, that it would not be wise to stop at this point with a merely negative answer. We recognize the force of the contention that the Manual of the Board does not sufficiently indicate just what the relative powers and functions of the Board and the Missions are and that clearer definition is desirable. While the specific proposal of the Chosen Mission is impracticable, there is a fundamental question that merits constructive treatment; and this treatment should include the relations of the Missions to the churches and governments in the Mission field as well as to the Board. The form of this adjustment should not be influenced by the peculiar local conditions in one of the twenty-seven Missions, but it should have reference to the broad and permanent conditions of modern missionary work as affecting and affected by all of the Missions and fields. It should be given the most careful thought and special care should be made to secure the mature judgment of representative missionaries from various fields. Moreover, there are other important matters, particularly those growing out of the great war, on which the counsel of wise and able missionaries would be of large value. It is already apparent that the foreign missionary enterprise must face new and grave problems after the war and that there should be the most thoughtful consideration of the whole situation and of the heavily enlarged responsibilities which it would entail. Experience has shown that it is difficult to secure a satisfactory consensus of missionary opinion by having each Mission act independently upon a given matter. It appears desirable to have some gathering of missionaries which will be fairly representative of all the Missions and where conclusions can be reached after mutual conference. Manifestly, such a conference cannot be held while the war is in progress and manifestly, too, the Missions on the field ought to be given ample advance opportunity to appoint their representatives.

The Board is therefore planning to hold, as soon as world conditions shall permit, a Conference of furloughed missionaries for the consideration of these and other questions of vital moment. We do not deem it proper to place on the docket of that Conference any proposal that would call for a change in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church or challenge the absolute right and duty of the General Assembly to "superintend and conduct by its own proper authority the work of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church by a Board appointed for that purpose and directly amenable to said Assembly." We believe that the Church regards this question as closed. But we believe that there are several questions of policies and methods which may be wisely considered as well as the large and solemn matters to which reference was made in the preceding paragraph. The Missions should be given notice of the date far enough in advance to enable them, in passing upon furloughs for the year in question, to see that their members who will be at home are those whom the Missions would like to have represent them, each Mission to recommend to the Board any readjustments in the regular times of furloughs that may be necessary to give effect to this suggestion, either by ante-dating some furloughs or by

5/31/1918 — p.19 A.J.B.

deferring others. We in the Board ardently desire such a conference in order that we may take counsel with the missionaries, and we are confident that it will be of great value to us as well as to the Missions.

In behalf of the Board,

Arthur J. Brown, Secretary.

[note from the editors]

This whole letter is typical of the bureaucratic mind. At the General Assembly of May, 1919, the Board presented for ratification a plan for a *Union Board of Missions* containing the following;

"On the field abroad, all problems of missionary administration should be determined by the new board."

This was done without consultation with the church's missionary workers and one year before the Post War Conference. The Missions' request for a commission on the subject was refused presentation at the same assembly.

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp. 155-175.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

New York, New York
(XLL)

June 4, 1918
BOARD LETTER NO. 458

Arthur Judson Brown

Transfer of the Rev. Harry A. Rhodes and the Return of Dr. O.R. Avison

I presented these actions of your Executive Committee to the Board and read Dr. Adams' explanation. The Board instructed me to refer you to the reasons stated in Board Letters No. 421 of December 6th, No. 425 of January 8th, and No. 432 of January 25th and to add that whether the word "appeal" as descriptive of a technical mode of procedure was correctly or incorrectly used, the essential facts remain that the Field Board of Managers invited Mr. Rhodes to a professorship in the College; that he stated his desire to accept that invitation; that he was more urgently needed there than in the station to which the Mission assigned him where, indeed, there was no vacancy; that the Mission was unwilling to transfer him to the College; that the Field Board of Managers knowing this voted unanimously "that the Board press for the appointment of Mr. H.A. Rhodes to the faculty of the College through the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A."; that this action could only mean an appeal to the Board in a matter on which no relief could be secured from the Mission; that the President of the College informed the Board that the action of the Field Board of Managers was intended to have this effect and that there was no other recourse; and that the Mission voted in 1915 that "we, the Mission, cannot see our way clear to participate in Seoul College and we ask the Board to make arrangements to operate the College independent of the Mission."

As for the return of Dr. Avison, he did not come on a denominational errand but as president of a Union College whose Board of Managers on the field and whose Cooperating Committee on Christian Education in Chosen in North America, representing four other denominational Boards beside our own, deemed it imperative for him to come on the business of the College. The Board simply acquiesced in their request, and it would have been a breach of comity and even of Christian courtesy if it had taken technical advantage of the fact that the President of the College is a Presbyterian to refuse such permission.

In both of these cases, the Board simply acted in conformity with the request of the Mission in 1915 that "we, the Mission, cannot see our way clear to participate in Seoul College and we ASK THE BOARD TO MAKE ARRANGEMENTS TO OPERATE THE COLLEGE INDEPENDENT OF THE MISSION." If the Mission desires to rescind that action, the Board would be glad to know of it; but as long as that action stands, the Board cannot be justly blamed for following the course which the Mission itself has requested. The literal phraseology of the Manual regarding the powers of a Mission must necessarily have a generously Christian interpretation when applied to our relations with union institutions in which we deal with other denominational Missions and Boards; and when, as in this case, a Mission declines to cooperate with a union institution with which the Board and the home Church cooperate, conditions are created which no manual rule can exactly cover.

(signed)

Arthur J. Brown

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp. 95 - 96.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

(LXXIV)

BOARD LETTER NO. 460

New York, New York

June 12, 1918

Arthur J. Brown

The General Assembly

To the Chosen Mission.

Dear Friends: -

I have recently returned from the meeting of the General Assembly at Columbus, Ohio. You will, of course, see accounts of the proceedings in the religious papers which you take, but you will be interested in a few additional words about the foreign missionary aspects of the Assembly. The Standing Committee, under the chairmanship of the Rev. Joseph A. Vance, D.D., Pastor of the First Church of Detroit, was exceedingly sympathetic and most heartily desirous of doing everything in its power for the cause. A considerable number of furloughed missionaries attended the sessions of the Assembly. Three spoke at the popular meeting Wednesday evening, and four or five others took part in the discussion on the floor of the Assembly on Foreign Missions day. It was my turn to represent the Board in the annual address. At the close of the morning session, the Chairman of the Committee read the names of the Missionaries who had died during the year, the Assembly standing in reverent silence. Then Mr. Copeland, a prominent layman in the Brown Street Church of Columbus, suggested that at the funeral of a soldier of his country the bugler sounded taps and that it would be appropriate for the bugler who was on the platform to sound taps in memory of the soldiers of the cross who had died on the foreign field. The bugler thereupon stepped forward, and you can hardly imagine the tender solemnity of the moment as the strains of the bugle sounded through the great auditorium. Not a word of criticism regarding Foreign Missions was heard from the beginning to the end of the Assembly. I have never known an Assembly to be more warmly sympathetic, and the Board and the missionaries were encouraged to go forward with the full assurance of the support of the Church. The Chairman of the Sub-Committee on the Records of the Board reported that they had been read from beginning to end and that the Committee was amazed and deeply gratified by the immense range and variety of the work of the year. A long list of resolutions was adopted by the Assembly, the ones that will be chiefly interesting to you being as follows:

"10. That the General Assembly approve and commend the plan of the Board to hold, as soon as practicable after the close of the war, a conference with available furloughed missionaries, for the purpose of promoting mutual understanding and fellowship, more fully unifying policies and methods, suggesting such improvements as may be deemed desirable, and considering program for the enlargement and better equipment of the work, and the best way to deal with the extraordinary conditions growing out of the war, and ties to the Foreign Missionary enterprise. The Board will welcome to this conference representatives of the Women's Boards and of the Executive Commission of the General Assembly."

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Brown

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp. 176, 177.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

(XLII.)

MISSION MINUTES, 1918
Executive Committee Report, Section 10

10. The Committee requested the Chairman to write a letter to the Board concerning its action and the grounds for the same, in transferring Mr. Rhodes to Seoul College. The Chairman wrote:

"In Board Letter 432 the Board's action is based upon Sec. 40 of the Manual relating to the 'Powers of the Mission' where the right of appeal is given a missionary when not satisfied with his appointment by the Mission. It is specified that an appeal against the action may be made to the Board for final decision. It is also specified that any request requiring the action of the Board should be accompanied by the action of the Mission upon it. In reference to the statements in the Board action on these points the Committee wished me to say that it had never been informed that any appeal was being made by either Mr. Rhodes or the College; that in so far as any of its members knew no information to that effect had ever been made public on the field. It was entirely unknown to the Mission.

"It wished me also to say that members of the College Board inform it that no such appeal over the action of the Mission has ever been made by the Board of the College. The only action of that Board was as follows:

"Chosen Christian College Board of Managers, 8/26-30/17.

"It was moved and unanimously carried that the Board press for the appointment of Mr. H.A. Rhodes to the faculty of the College through the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in U.S.A."

"Mr. Rhodes writes me as Chairman of the Committee:

"I did not know until Board Letter 432 arrived that my letter to the Board had been regarded as an appeal. I did not use that word in my correspondence, had never looked up the Manual on the point, and had not thought of taking that course. Consequently I am not a little disconcerted at the wording of the Board action."

"A Board action based on Par. 40 of the Manual, providing for a formal appeal over a Mission action to the Board for final decision, surely would call for more preceding history of action on the field than is shown in this case. Manifestly none of the conditions imposed in the Manual upon such action seem to have been met. The action of the Board to the effect that:

"In these circumstances there seems to be no alternative but for the Board to act on the pending appeal on its merits in harmony with Par. 40 of the Manual. The Committee and Council therefore recommend that the appeal of Mr. Rhodes and the Field Board of Managers be sustained." does not seem to us in accord with the provisions of the Manual."

(from bound copy entitled PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, p.96.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

(XLIII.)

MISSION MINUTES, 1918
Executive Committee Report, Section 5

5. In view of the ad-interim action of the Mission No. 163 disapproving the return of Dr. Avison to the States Mr. Koons presented to the Committee Dr. Brown's letter of October 17th to Dr. Avison in which he says: "I am asking Dr. Jones to tell Dr. North that I am in favor of your coming and that I hope he will stretch his authority as Chairman of the Joint Committee far enough to send you a cable, even though he cannot consult all the members of the Committee." Also a cable received by Dr. Avison, October 29th, 1917, as follows: "Return approved. Brown agrees. North." It was passed that the Chairman be requested to write the Board in view of the above information and express our conviction that this further accentuates the necessity of definition of relation between field and Board. The Chairman wrote:

"It seems to us that the primary and fundamental relation of a missionary is to his Mission and Board, under which he has been commissioned and works. Arrangement of work which he carries for these comes first, and when other duties put extraordinary claims upon him the meeting of them must be subject to the permission and provision of these bodies. The Manual regulations on the subject seem clear: 'All requests requiring Board action should be accompanied with the action of the Mission upon them' and, 'Any other leave of absence other than the furlough (regular) thus provided for will be by vote of the Board on recommendation of the Mission.'

"Dr. Avison had asked leave of the Mission for an entirely other purpose than the College, which had not been granted. No request was made to the Mission for this purpose. There was no action either on the part of the Mission or his Station. Nor was the Mission notified of any such request being made. The Mission has never been informed even of any specific Board action on the matter. Apparently the only request made at home or on the field was one directly and personally to yourself, and was handled in the same way. Undoubtedly Dr. Avison would have the right to prefer such a request to the Board; he would also have the right of appeal over adverse Mission action; without question the Board has power to authorize his return; but the mode of such action is provided for in the Manual, and does not seem to us to have been that which was pursued."

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp.96 - 97.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

Apportionment Committee Request to Board with Regard to the Chosen Christian College

In view of the confusion arising from the lack of exact delimitation of the relation between the Chosen Christian College and the Chosen Mission; and in view of the further fact that the work as now administered is in conflict with the Manual rule as regards institutions within the limits of the Mission; and assuming that the Board proposes to continue the institution although in opposition to the judgment of the Mission:
Resolved:

That we request the Board to continue to do so only in case it secures the permission of the General Assembly for the suspension in the case of the Chosen Christian College of the Manual rule (Par. 40) that "the Mission has general care and supervision of all work within the limits"; and obtain its authorization for the establishment and operation of the College as an institution within the limits of the Mission, yet wholly outside and unrelated to it.

The reasons underlying this resolution may be stated as follows:

1. The present system of operating is a source of constant conflict with the recognized work of the Chosen Mission. Without reviewing again the circumstances which led the Mission at its Annual Meeting of 1915 to request the Board to operate the College, if it was to be established at all, as an institution outside of the Chosen Mission, it may be pointed out that the Board's assent on this point without accurate and authoritative definition has given rise to a difficult and anomalous situation.

It has left the institution in the Mission but not of it; its budget a part of the assigned income of the Mission, but separate from it, and the Mission with no relation to it; its faculty full members of the Mission with all privileges and rights towards all the work of the Mission, but the Mission specifically excluded from any authority or rights towards theirs; and the institution established and operated outside of the only field superintendence recognized by the Manual regulations or authorized by the General Assembly, and in opposition to the repeated and nearly unanimous judgment of the Assembly's agent on the field. Proceeding upon this basis without distinct separation and definition by Assembly authorization has produced much confusion and conflict,

two instances of which may be cited as follows:

1. The acting President of the College is also at the head of the Severance Medical College and Hospital, an institution connected with the Mission and perhaps the largest of its kind in the Orient. The position is one of large responsibilities and onerous duties, and the work is done under the assignment of the Mission. The Manual regulations require that any leave of absence other than the regular furlough shall be by vote of the Board upon recommendation of the Mission. (Par. 18c.) During the past year, after having applied for leave of absence for medical work which was not granted, he dropped his regular Mission assignment on the invitation of the Chairman of the Joint Committee in America, and returned to America contrary to the disapproving action of the Mission, and so far as the Mission has been informed without specific Board authorization, for nearly a year's absence in relation to the College interests.
2. At the Annual Meeting of 1917 the Rev. H.A. Rhodes requested to be transferred to teaching in the Chosen Christian College. This the Mission declined to do. He was an experienced worker; there were many unfilled vacancies in the Mission; and he was greatly needed in the direct Mission work. The Board subsequently took action upon its own authority, transferring him directly to the College. This lessening of the Mission's forces of experienced workers has not only embarrassed the Mission in its work but made it much more difficult for the Mission to fill the vacancy in Seoul Station's evangelistic work caused by the death of Dr. Underwood.

2. The Revised Educational Ordinance of Chosen raised a fresh complication. The ordinance requires that all private schools from primary up eliminate religious instruction and exercises from their curricula. New institutions must do so at once; old institutions have ten years of grace. The Seoul institution

was classified as a new institution and the Administration in granting a charter required that, with the exception of the Theological department, all departments should be secularized and no student should matriculate in any but his own department.

That the acceptance of a charter under the new ordinance would, in the judgment of the Mission, prejudice all the educational work of the Mission, is sufficiently indicated by the fact that although it approved the application for a charter for the Severance Medical College on the ground that, "A Medical College stands on a somewhat different plane than other institutions of higher general education with regard to religious instruction for the general student body (Minutes 1916), it specifically refused permission for the establishment of an Academy at Chairyung with the statement that, "Because of the possible effect on other educational institutions of the establishment of such an academy, since it would have to be established under the new educational ordinance, and we do not approve of applying for a permit under these ordinances at the present time."

The Board representatives have applied for and secured such a charter for the College, all the educational work of the Mission is now laboring under the handicap arising from this action, and it is only fair to the Mission that the distinction between the College and the Mission should be made clear to the Government in view of the Assembly resolution of 1917 counseling that the educational work of the Mission should be carried on with religious instruction as long as it is legally permissible.

3. With no intention whatever of discourtesy and with all due respect for our superior body, the Board, we would point out that the irregularity and confusion of the present situation, which must necessarily increase, is in no small measure due to the fact that the whole situation is in entire discord and out of harmony with the General Assembly's regulations for the conduct of the work. The Mission is the Assembly's agent upon the field. (Assembly Minutes 1887, pp. 23,24, Sec. 6.) The Manual contains the Assembly's regulations for the direction of its operative agents in the conduct of its foreign work. The Manual rule (Sec. 40) provides that the Mission have general care and oversight of all work within its limits.

In the case of the Chosen Christian College the Board action stated (Board Letter 249) that if the Mission did not see its way clear to co-operate in the establishing and operating of the College, "the Board authorizes such members of the Mission as are willing to do so, to represent the Board in organizing the College." This was at once done and the institution is still being operated on this basis in apparent disregard of the Assembly's regulations for its foreign work, and of the principles laid down in the Board actions of Board Letters Nos. 64 and 80. In these it is stated:

"The training of ministers, evangelists and other leaders of the Church is one of the most solemn and imperative duties of the Missions and Boards; a duty which cannot be transferred to independent bodies over which the Mission and Boards have no control * * * *. It is vital to the success of the whole missionary enterprise that the aims, methods and teachings of institutions of this kind should be kept in harmony with the evangelistic aim and work of the Missions and the Board; and under their responsible supervision as an integral and organic part of the work. In the case of union institutions the control of the Mission should be exercised through a Joint Field Board of Managers elected by and amenable to the co-operating Missions."

The Mission at its Annual Meeting of 1915, after the College had been organized as above, requested the Board to make suitable arrangements for its operation separate from the Mission. As yet this has not been done. We therefore respectfully request and, in view of the increasing confusion and injury resulting to the general work, we feel constrained to press the request, that, if it be operated at all, proper authorization be secured for the independent position of the College within the limits of the Mission, and an authorized definition of its relation to the Mission's work and workers be made.

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp.97-99.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

Seoul, Korea

August 2, 1918

Lillias H. Underwood

Extract of letter of Mrs. H.G. Underwood to Dr. Brown
(original letter in File #21-60 (or 21-68?))

RE: SEOUL STATION A SEPARATE MISSION.

Dear Dr. Brown:

I hope you are away at some cool retreat these hot days. I read your masterly 30-page letter on the mission control question and enjoyed it greatly. Things are becoming very sad in our Mission. I don't know that there is any way out but the separation of Seoul Station. So far as I can learn from others, the circumstances at Annual Meeting were such that it could hardly be possible to meet and transact any business again. Dr. Adams' resolutions to which our members sent a reply to the Board seem to me very unbrotherly, yet a majority voted on and passed them.

(from the microfilm records of the Board of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, PA, Series II, Reel #6, Record Group 140-4-26)

Seoul, Korea

August 22, 1918

Edwin Wade Koons
[Extracts of letter]

[Dear Dr. Brown:]

Personally, I do not want to have Seoul separated from the Mission, for that course would leave many who agree with me in other Stations in a hopeless minority in the Mission. H.E. Blair and Dr. Sharrocks, not to mention others who staunchly support the Chosen Christian College deserve better treatment than that, and our ranks are growing year by year, as Dr. Avison has doubtless told you. With Seoul in the Mission, the minority is far from a hopeless one, but if Seoul is taken out, the outlook is poor indeed.

There are other arguments against separation, most of which will suggest themselves to you. A strong one is the furore it would cause in the minds of Koreans and Japanese, as well as other Missions. Our Mission quarrels and the difficulties between the majority of the Mission and the Board, have been all too widely discussed for years.

In medical matters, Seoul or possibly I should say the Severance Hospital staff, has practical self-government, the Mission approving whatever is asked for by the staff, with the approval of the Station. In the Higher Education, the supporters of the Chosen Christian College, which includes most of the members of Seoul Station, have self-government by a special action of the Board. In evangelistic matters, there is no occasion for a difference of opinion between Seoul and the rest of the mission.

But in the case of these two schools, the difficulty is that it is impossible for most of the people living in Pyeng Yang or Taiku, or any other of the country stations, to understand our situation. As I said in my earlier letter, I am so convinced of the absolute necessity for self-government in this one additional matter, that if separation is the only way to get it, I am ready for separation. But where the Mission has allowed Seoul to act independently in conducting the Pierson Memorial Bible School and the Board has allowed a minority of the Mission to conduct the C.C.C. it should be possible for the largest Station in the Mission to conduct these two schools as it sees fit.

I have said enough on this. Here in Seoul we have to meet the competition of other private schools, mission and non-mission, registered and consequently enjoying the favor of the Government. Unless the Board helps us out, we will continue to lose ground steadily.

(LXXV)

BOARD LETTER NO. 468

In Re Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Chosen Mission
June 23 - July 4, 1918. (Manuscript Copy)

New York, New York

October 9, 1918

Arthur J. Brown

To the Chosen Mission.

Dear Friends: -

We received some time ago the manuscript Minutes of your annual meeting. Our first thought naturally was to wait until the printed minutes arrived as we know of your custom to print them and that they are so much easier to handle in that form. Mr. Whittemore, however, wrote that there might be some delay in getting them through the press this year and asked that the Board act, if possible, on the manuscript copy. We have, therefore, gone through them with care and they were presented to the Board at the meeting the 7th instant. I now write regarding them, taking up as usual only the items that appear to call for comment or action here, and, of course, omitting the items which have been already cleared in former correspondence. It has not been altogether easy to handle such a great mass of manuscript with unnumbered pages and no index and if we omit anything on which you desire action, we shall, of course, expect Mr. Whittemore to let us know. For convenience of reference I have caused the sheets to be paged here and I have referred to the actions in the order in which they appear in the manuscript.

Page 15. Request for the Appointment of a Commission from the General Assembly to participate in the After War Conference.

The following action was taken:

"The Chosen Mission having adopted a recommendation of its Executive Committee that the Board be requested to ask the General Assembly to appoint a Commission to participate in the conference with furloughed missionaries which the Board expects to call after the close of the war, the Board replied that in view of the action already taken by the General Assembly on recommendation of the Board no further action is necessary."

The text of the General Assembly's action, which I myself asked the Assembly's Committee to present, was given you in Board Letter No. 460 on June 12, Section 10, at the bottom of page 2. While the detailed plans for the conference have not yet been worked out, I may add unofficially that its object is not controversial or to settle questions in dispute between the Board and the Missions. We are happy in the belief that there are no such questions between the Board and the Missionary body as a whole, and that the relations are more harmonious and fraternal than they have ever been. Here and there a question is in process of adjustment between the Board and a particular Mission, but such questions are very few and can be handled in the ordinary course of procedure without demanding the valuable time of the representatives of twenty-seven Missions at a time when weighty interests of the kingdom of God are seriously involved. Of course, I do not mean that questions should be excluded which the Missions may deem it advisable to discuss at such a conference and the Missions are cordially invited to send to the Board any questions which they would like to have placed upon the docket. But the main business of the conference should be the frank facing of the large and solemn questions of world evangelization in the light of the conditions which the war has created, and to consider very earnestly and very prayerfully how we can more effectively meet them - not who is greater in the Kingdom of God, the Board or a Mission, but how can the Kingdom of God be more effectively and quickly realized. We are eager to have the presence of representatives of the Women's Boards and the General Assembly and also of other interested friends in the home Church - not as judges or umpires at a dispute, but as counselors and co-workers in a common cause at a time of grave crisis when all elements both at home and abroad should be united in heart for the work of our Lord and Savior. It should be borne in mind, too, that the conference should not be a legislative body, but a consultative and advisory one, and that its findings, in so far as they effect missionary policies and methods, should be submitted to all the Missions in order that they may have an opportunity to express an official judgment regarding them. However, this is merely an indication of the way that I am now thinking of the conference. We shall work out the details in due time and send them out to all concerned. I only wish we could tell more definitely when the conference can be held.

DELEGATES TO THE CONFERENCE AFTER THE WAR

The following action was taken:

"The Chosen Mission, having elected representatives for the conference with furloughed missionaries which the Board expects to hold after the end of the war, the Board replied that the date when the conference can be held is still so uncertain and the detailed plans are necessarily so undeveloped at this time, that it appears wise for the Board to defer action until it is able to consider in detail the character and principles and membership of the proposed conference and to report to all the Missions."

We may add that experience shows that of the present missionary force about two hundred are on furlough at a given time, and that they include men and women, ordained and lay, and usually represent all varieties of missionary work, evangelistic, educational, medical and literary, and practically all of the Missions except possibly one or two of the very smallest. Of course some of these missionaries would not find it practicable to attend the conference in New York on account of ill health or family cares, but the Board believes that it can reasonably count on an attendance of a large proportion of them. It appears fair to conclude that these missionaries should be deemed the basis of the conference and as reasonably representative of the whole missionary body, so that the work on the field need not be disturbed and extraordinary expenditures incurred by special returns to America on account of the conference save in very exceptional cases. For example, if a Mission which has a large medical work should happen to have no one of its medical missionaries on furlough, or if a Mission which has important educational work should have no representative of that work on furlough, consideration should be given to the question whether a special furlough should be arranged. Where, however, the furloughed members of a Mission include representatives of its varied work, or where, as in the case of such countries as China and India, there are several Missions, the varied forms of work done in that country are represented by furloughed members of one or more of its Missions, it appears fair to take such a fact into account. We must consider, too, the transportation question which we are advised is likely to be more difficult and costly for several years.

As the Chosen Mission with its large membership always has a considerable number of its members on furlough or health leave, the presumption would be that there would be less necessity for bringing home other of its members for the conference than in the case of almost any other Mission. When the time comes, your representation should include, if practicable, representatives of your evangelistic, educational and medical work and it should also include women. Undoubtedly some missionaries should come home for the conference, and perhaps some should come from Chosen. As the year when the conference can be held cannot now be known we cannot state at this time whether it will be necessary to incur the expense of bringing anyone home from Chosen on purpose for the conference, or in case it should be necessary, can we tell now whether the missionaries to be brought should be evangelists, educators or physicians. It will first be necessary to see how adequately members of the Mission who will be in America at that time represent the various forms of the Mission's work. However, all this is merely preliminary and tentative. Careful plans will be worked out in due time and sent to all the Missions.

With warm regards to all the members of the Mission and with frequent and earnest prayer that God's blessing may rest upon you and all your work, I remain, as ever,

Affectionately yours,
Arthur J. Brown

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp.177-179.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

Seoul, Korea

October 21, 1918

Frank N.D. Buchman

Dear Dr. Moffett,

I am enclosing the letter I spoke of. I am convinced that the true basis for unity and progress rests on the one word LIFE.

I am following your suggestion about Crowell. I can write him very cordially about your work. You to me are an ideal missionary. God has helped us here and we are working in power.

We are grateful for your helpfulness during the Peng Yang days. May you have every blessing for you and yours in the Winter's work. I shall be glad if you will write me c/o Thomas Cook and Son, Yokohama about any striking developments.

Do remember me to the cook and the boy and tell him I will send the pictures later.

I am yours faithfully,

Frank N.D. Buchman

To the Chosen Mission.

Dear Friends:

In acting upon the minutes of your annual meeting October 7th, the Board considered your action on page 78 regarding the Chosen Christian College. Second, there was also presented the statement signed by fifteen dissenting members of the Mission. After some discussion, the Board voted to postpone action for two weeks and directed that copies of the full text of the two documents be mailed to the members of the Board so that each one could have opportunity to study them. At the meeting October 21st the matter was taken up again and a draft of a proposed reply presented. The Rev. Dr. Charles R. Erdman made the point that the reply did not sufficiently cover some of the points which he believed the Mission deemed important, and that these points should be more definitely and adequately cleared. The Board therefore referred the whole matter back to the Chosen Committee and the Executive Council with instructions to confer with Dr. Erdman and report at the next meeting, November 4th. In consultation with Dr. Erdman the last sentence of the proposed reply was changed and a considerable section added so as to make the whole report more complete and comprehensive. This revised and enlarged report was submitted to the Board November 4th with the unanimous recommendation of the Chosen Committee and the Executive Council, in which Dr. Erdman concurred, that it be adopted. I have explained this process in order that you may see that the Board does not act hastily or unadvisedly in these important matters, but that it goes into them with care and thoroughness. The report as finally amended and enlarged is as follows:

"Consideration was given to an action of the Chosen Mission to the effect that 'the present system of operating the Chosen Christian College in Seoul is a source of constant conflict with the recognized work of the Chosen Mission,' that it 'has given rise to a difficult and anomalous situation,' and that 'assuming that the Board proposes to continue the institution although in opposition to the judgment of the Mission,' the Mission 'requests the Board to continue to do so' only in case it secures the permission of the General Assembly for the suspension in the case of the Chosen Christian College of the Manual rule (Par. 40) that 'the Mission has general care and supervision of all work within its limits, and obtain its authorization for the establishment and operation of the College as an institution within the limits of the Mission, yet wholly outside and unrelated to it.' The Board also received a communication entitled: Some Reasons Why Fifteen Members of the Chosen Mission Voted Against the Resolution Concerning the Chosen Christian College."

"The Board replied that its actions regarding the College were reported to and approved by the General Assembly immediately following. Four years have elapsed since the essential actions were taken in 1914, during which period the institution has been formally opened and legally chartered by the Japanese Government-General; a valuable site has been secured with the assistance of the Government-General; missionaries have been assigned to the faculty and are at work; students are in attendance; large sums have been secured for buildings; plans for their construction are well advanced; and obligations have been incurred with other Boards and with the Government-General which cannot now be honorably evaded. The Board sees no reason for reopening the question at this late day, nor has the Mission given any new reason for doing so. Paragraph 40 of the Manual, to which the Mission refers, is not involved, since the Board has not deprived the Mission of its powers in relation to the College. The Mission voluntarily and against the wish of the Board abdicated its powers in respect to the College by declining to recognize it as an integral part of the work within its bounds with which the Board and the Home Church are cooperating. The Board agrees with the Mission that the resulting situation is 'difficult and anomalous' and that it is a 'source of constant conflict' and 'confusion.' But this unfortunate situation has been created by the course of the Mission in refusing to accept the decision properly made by the

Board and approved by the General Assembly; and the Mission is entirely free to remedy it at any time by cooperating with the College, as the Board very cordially desires it to do. The Board commended the statement of the fifteen members of the minority of the Mission as a fair and dignified statement of the situation.

"To the request of the Mission that 'if it (the College) be operated at all, proper authorization be secured for the independent position of the College within the limits of the Mission,' the Board replies that 'proper authorization' has already been given in actions of the Board which were communicated to the Mission in Board Letters Nos. 249 of December 8, 1914, and 316 of February 10, 1916, the latter having been based on the action of the Mission as shown on page 45 of the printed minutes of its annual meeting in 1915. These actions of the Board were submitted to and approved by the General Assembly the following year in connection with its review of the records of the Board.

"To the further request of the Mission that 'an authorized definition of its (the College's) relation to the Mission's work and workers be made,' reply be given that the Board's action which was quoted in Board Letter No. 249 of December 8, 1914, stated 'that our share in this College is to be regarded as an integral and necessary part of the work of the Presbyterian Church in Korea and entitled to full recognition as such.' The relation of the College to the Mission is the same as that of other union institutions, such as the Severance Union Medical College and the Junior Union College in Pyeng Yang, except that the Mission has not availed itself of its right to elect representatives on the Field Board of Managers.

"The relation of the members of the faculty to the Mission is in harmony with the policy in many fields, which the Board see no adequate reason for modifying in Chosen, namely: that all regularly appointed Presbyterian missionaries assigned to union institutions are members of their respective Missions in full and regular standing on the same plane as other missionaries, in accordance with paragraph 39 of the Manual which provides that 'a Mission consists of all foreign missionaries under appointment by the Board within specified territorial limits.' Any change in the relation of the Chosen College missionaries to the Mission would necessarily apply to the missionaries who are engaged in union institutions elsewhere, including the Junior Union College at Pyeng Yang.

"From the viewpoint of home administration, the College is not directly under our Board but is under the direction of the Cooperating Board of Trustees in North America representing all the cooperating missionary Boards; but in this respect the Chosen College does not differ from the Severance Union Medical College, the Shantung Christian University, the Nanking Christian University and various other union institutions. The cooperating Missions on the field have their voice in these institutions through their right to elect representatives on the Field Boards of Managers, and the only reason why the Chosen Mission has no voice in managing the College in Seoul is because it has voluntarily chosen not to have it. Meantime, in deference to the wishes of the Mission the Board has followed the course stated in the Board letter referred to (December 8, 1914), namely: "The Board will endeavor, as far as practicable, to provide its share of faculty and maintenance without lessening the force and budget that would be normally assigned to the Mission; although the Board cannot of course guarantee this irrespective of any conditions that may arise. To avoid confusion, the Board will designate that they can be noted separately from those that are subject to transfer on the field."

"It should be noted that while the Board did 'not guarantee to provide its share of faculty and maintenance without lessening the force and budget that would be normally assigned to the Mission, irrespective of any conditions that may arise,' the Board has actually done so thus far. No money has been given to the College that otherwise would have been given to the other work in Chosen; the only missionary transferred to the College (Mr. Rhodes) was promptly replaced by a new appointment; and 'the College appropriations and missionary appointments' have been 'noted separately from those that are subject to transfer on the field.'"

* * * * *

This report was unanimously adopted. As it was intended to be self-explanatory, I assume that I

11/06/1918 - p.3 A.J.B.
need not enlarge upon it. It represents the matured and careful judgment of the Board and we earnestly hope that it will commend itself to your judgment.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Brown

(XLVI.) EXTRACT FROM A PAMPHLET OF CHOSEN CHRISTIAN COLLEGE - NOV., 1918, P.3.
FIELD BOARD OF MANAGERS:

Consists of eleven missionaries representing the cooperating Missions.

Northern Methodist Mission: Rev. W.A. Noble, Ph.D., Rev. A.L. Becker, Rev. B. W. Billings.

Northern Presbyterian Mission: A.M. Sharrocks, M.D., Rev. James S. Gale, D.D., Rev. H.E.

Blair, Rev. Harry A. Rhodes.

Southern Methodist Mission: Rev. J.L. Gerdine.

Canadian Presbyterian Mission: Rev. Milton Jack, B.D..

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp.99 - 101.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

A Brief on the Subject of the Desirability of an Adjustment Between Home Base and Field as Relates to Field Administration

Introduction

The Presbyterian system is essentially a representative democracy expressing itself in a series of graded courts. In these courts of the Church two distinct types of authority are exercised. These are judicial and administrative or operative. In applying the principles fundamental to Presbyterianism as they exist in the relations of these bodies to the organization of our Foreign Mission system, we must not forget that one is ecclesiastical and the other only administrative or operative. But these principles apply to the administrative functions of the Church bodies as much as to their judicial functions, so that we may set the judicial aspect of the one aside and compare them only in the character common to both, that of administrative organization in religious effort. In this they approach so nearly that the application of the fundamental principles of the one may clearly determine the degree of harmony or disharmony of the other.

1. The Organic Principles of Presbyterianism as an Administrative System. In the Church the direct and characteristic series is the congregation, the Session, the Presbytery and the General Assembly.

A. Each Has a Sphere of Exclusive Original Jurisdiction. – Each has a certain sphere of operation in which it holds exclusive original jurisdiction in its relation to the other bodies, whether superior or subsidiary. To illustrate: the Congregation has exclusive original jurisdiction in the electing of Elders, Deacons and Trustees for itself; the Session has the same over the communicant membership; the Presbytery toward its ministerial members; and the Assembly to matters of order and doctrine. No superior body can intrude to exercise these functions or to dictate their exercise.

B. Each Has a Larger Sphere of Ordinary Original Jurisdiction. – Outside of the sphere mentioned above also is a larger sphere in which each body currently exercises original jurisdiction for many functions, but in which it does not have this so clearly as an exclusive prerogative.

C. When Properly Exercised This Also Becomes Final Jurisdiction. – There is a sense also in which each body, certainly in the first and commonly in the second sphere, exercises not only original jurisdiction, but for all practical purposes final jurisdiction as well. For all these functions are exercised by each under a recognized established body of regulations. So that so long as their exercise is conducted in clear accord with those regulations, the body is protected from intrusion from above and its decisions become final.

D. The Power of Review and Control. – The completing factor is the power of review and control which each holds over its subsidiary bodies. The system thus assures each continuing to work within its proper limits and in accord with its governing regulation.

All these elements are fundamental characteristics of Presbyterianism in the organized administrative pursuit of its ends. Responsibility with its necessary accompanying authority is appropriately distributed among the graded bodies. Each body is protected from intrusion in the proper exercise of its appointed functions. Each is guarded from the improper exercise of them. In so far as character of organization can give strength and success and glory, that of Presbyterianism lies here, as does that of representative democracy. It is the peculiar source of strength and success in Presbyterianism that, remaining of the people, the organization of its operating administration is such that it can and does locate responsibility for each function in that body of its series most directly concerned in that function, and therefore the body with the most intimate knowledge and the most direct interest, and consequently the strongest claim upon immediate Divine guidance and endowment.

II. Comparison with This of the Operative System of Our Foreign Missions Work

In the system of our Foreign Missions organization the series recognized begins with the individual missionary in charge of his district or institution; then the Station; the Mission; and the Board of Foreign Missions in New York.

A. The Field Organization. — The field organization covering the first three may be said to be framed on a consistent Presbyterian basis. The individual missionary has direct charge of his work which has been assigned him by the Mission. This is under the superintendence and direction of the local station, composed of all active workers in the immediate field, and in it each has a vote. The organized Mission in turn has superintendence and direction of the work of all the Stations within its bounds, and each active missionary is a voting member in it. The work of each body is conducted with limitations and regulations established in the Board's Manual and the Mission's Rules and By-laws.

B. The System Abruptly Broken in the Relation of Field and Home Base. — When we come to the connection of Home and Field organization, however, the system is abruptly broken. The Mission, the supreme operating body on the field, composed of all the workers within its bounds and superintending all the existing work, at once ceases, in its relation to its superior body, the Board, to have any authority whatever inherent in itself over the work it superintends. A well-established body of regulations define the Mission's relations to its subsidiary field bodies and the limits of their mutual operation. No regulations of any kind exist defining the Mission sphere of operations and its jurisdiction in relation to the Board. Organically field jurisdiction as exercised by field bodies is only by current Board permission. At any time, upon any matter, which its own judgment may so direct, the only real source in which real operating authority inheres, the Board, may exercise it directly and without regard to the judgment of the field organization. This covers all lines both of policy and work, and is equally true both for initial and final jurisdiction.

In brief, the system in its field organization is Presbyterian and democratic, but in its connection between Field and Home Base it becomes as distinctly autocratic. The field organization becomes simply the creature of the Board exercising jurisdiction as it is permitted; unable to exercise it except as it is permitted; and with no defined and mutually recognized regulations for either.

C. This Fact Forbids Real Democracy Even In Field Organization. — It follows, also, that this change at this point makes void the possibility of any real democracy within the field bodies themselves; for it is a fundamental concept of democracy that the functions and authority which bodies exercise, they exercise as inherent in themselves, and not by the current permission of a superior. Scientifically defined, the first only can be a democratic system, and the second, by virtue of the character of its head, as clearly becomes an autocratic one throughout its entirety.

As parts in an organized system the field bodies in relation to the Board have no sphere in which they exercise exclusive original jurisdiction. They have no body of established regulations working in accord with which their jurisdiction in field matters becomes final. Review and control is the only Presbyterian factor left and in the absence of the other two this ceases to be distinctly Presbyterian.

III. Misinterpretations of the Above Statement to Be Guarded Against

A. This Is Not a Criticism of the Board. — The writer wishes it to be distinctly understood that the above statement is in no sense a criticism of the Board in New York. He is a loyal and sympathetic co-worker with it, and gives place to none in his admiration of all it is accomplishing in the Church's great work of evangelizing the world. It is a criticism of a system. The Board is not the author of the system but simply an agent in it, whose place and responsibility in it has been defined for it by its superior body. The author is the General Assembly and the system is its system. Since the Assembly's organization of the work in 1837 when it determined that it would "Of its own proper authority superintend and conduct the work of Foreign Missions by a Board," and the Board was appointed and "charged with the duty of organizing and superintending the work of disseminating the Gospel in unevangelized lands" no further definition or distribution in administration has been made.

Responsibility has been left where it was then placed, solely in the hands of the Board. Authority cannot be separated from responsibility. The two must go hand in hand. Hence the present system.

B. The Present Relation Is Not in Itself An Improper One. - Nor do I wish to be understood as saying that this relation between home and field is in itself an improper one. It is not. The fact that the Foreign Mission work of practically all denominations was organized on the same essential basis sufficiently indicates this. But conditions are largely the determining factor in propriety of method, and changed conditions call for adaptation of method. The days of new fields, of small Missions, of simple evangelism and of inexperienced field forces were, and under the same conditions may be still, the days when such a relation is the proper one; even though it is Episcopal rather than Presbyterian. Paternalism is proper during years of weakness or immaturity. But when fields have been long occupied, the field Mission large and well organized, the working force numerous, tried and experienced, the work complex, differentiated and interknit with multifarious field conditions, to continue wholly in this relation is not only contrary to the genius of Presbyterianism, but unjust to the larger bodies of the Church's presbyters working in the foreign field and, when occasional differences arise, may involve actual disaster to the work.

C. The Present Method of Operation Not Ordinarily a Dictatorial One. - Nor do I wish to be understood as saying that the current mode of operation in the home-field relation is a dictatorial or arbitrary one. It is the opposite of this. In ordinary current operations large discretion is left with the field organizations in almost every line, and even when there may be minor divergence of judgment, not infrequently the judgment of the field body is allowed to stand. This mode of ordinary current permission, however, does not affect the principle of the system; nor does it affect the system's operation in fact, when real and serious differences of judgment arise between field and home base as concerning field matters, as at times they needs must. Responsibility is vested solely in the Board for all matters, great and small, and in such case it is but proper that responsibility should have the final and authoritative word. Proper regulations and definition as between operating bodies are not made for the times when they all agree. They exist for those times of serious difference of judgment which occasionally cannot but arise. They are the prohibitor of confusion and dissension; the guardian of harmony and efficiency. Would not ultimate confusion and even dissension be inevitable in the Presbyterian system if the subsidiary bodies were so placed as to not only have no representation in the General Assembly, but had no definition or recognized regulation of their administrative functions in relation to the Assembly's authority over them. If the first were necessary, as in the case of the Foreign Missions system, so much the more would efficiency require the correction of the second.

D. Does Not Mean the Elimination of Board Authority in Field Matters. - No more do I wish to be understood as advocating the elimination of Board authority from field matters. I do not agree with the Report of the Committee on Principles and Methods of Administration in the 1917 Conference of Foreign Mission Boards of North America to the effect that it should be a relation of cooperative counsel and persuasion. It should also include authority. To not do so is to be deprecated as much as anything in the present method. For the Board has sources and kinds of wisdom which no single field force possesses quite as much as field force has sources and kinds of wisdom with regard to its own work which the Board cannot possess.

IV. The Above Illustrated in the Work and Character of the Korea Mission.

The truth of all the above is well illustrated in the case of the Korea Mission. This Mission by comity agreement has exclusive responsibility in a territory of 5,000,000 people. Besides its own evangelistic work, in this territory is a self-governing Presbyterian Church of 1,190 congregations and a Christian constituency of 107,858, with its own Presbyteries and General Assembly, the product of the Mission's work and with which the work of the Mission is most intimately bound up. In its eight stations it has seven Mission hospitals and eight Mission academies. It has federated and union relations with five other Missions involving a theological seminary, a medical college and two hospitals, an arts

college, Bible Institute, tract society, Bible translation, and many other union undertakings. Since the introduction of modern government by Japan many problems have arisen with the authorities, difficult and delicate of solution, and involving the Mission's own work, its federated and union undertakings, and its relations to the Korean Church. The Mission itself has 130 adult members of whom 76 are active voting ones, all carefully selected when commissioned; and of those, 41 are presbyters of the home church. Many of these have been laboring in the field between 20 and 30 years, and the large majority have been there more than ten years. The work is carefully organized and superintended on all lines upon a thoroughly Presbyterian basis of graded bodies in all of which every member has a voice and every active member a vote. Its annual budget runs into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. All that exists has developed under the hands of these missionaries and in many true senses is the intimate fruit of their labors. Outside of the Boards there is possibly nothing in the home church that parallels it as a large efficient operating organization carrying so diversified a direct work.

But organically it has no defined position, and when differences of judgment arise between field and home on any field matter, it has no functions inherent in itself and conserved to it by recognized regulation. Organically it administers simply by the current permission of its superior body, which permission at any time, in any subject, may be withdrawn, and initial instructions issued or field decisions reversed. In a work of such magnitude, complexity and interknit field conditions, which only the body of field operators can fully understand, it is scarcely more than necessary to state the conditions to realize the operative weakness of the method.

V. The Point that Is Being Pressed

The point I am pressing is nothing more than the most fundamental principles of Presbyterianism. At least in the larger Missions, those functions which are proper to the field organization should be definitely assigned to it, their exercise conserved to it, and on this basis the administrative relation of home and field reasonably defined. For the larger Missions, that all real authority, initial, appellate and final, should rest in the Home Base is improper; it is unjust to the field force and it does not conduce to the best operation.

VI. Suggested Solutions to the Difficulty

Of late years, as the growth of the work has produced increased embarrassments along this line, three suggestions for a solution have come from the field.

A. The Petition of 1915. - At the 1915 Annual Meeting of the Korea Mission the Executive Committee presented the following suggestion to the Mission and it was laid on the table for one year that it might appear in the printed minutes and so stir consideration. The proposed action was as follows:

We, the Korea Mission, do respectfully petition the Board that it provide that, although as in the past the Board under its authority of "review and control" possess the power of veto over the actions of the Mission, yet in FIELD MATTERS ONLY, in the rare cases where the Mission would deem it necessary, the Mission would have the right to act again upon the matter voted, and, should it repeat its former action by a two-thirds majority, the Mission's judgment shall finally decide the matter, subject only to appeal to the General Assembly.

1. The location and assignment of all missionaries commissioned by the Board to work within the bounds of the Mission.
2. The return from the field of workers whom the corporate Mission does not consider suitable for the work.
3. The powers to be exercised by field committees working within the bounds of the Mission.
4. The superintendence and control of all existing field institutions.
5. The initiatory in new institutions (subject to Board vote as to actual step) as to number, character and location.
6. The principles of self-support in the native church as related to Mission operations.

7. Union or federation upon the field in work with the Missions of other denominations.
8. The relation of the Mission and its members to the Korean Church.

This proposal related only to the Korea Mission. Ordinary relations are left as they are and the difficulty is sought to be solved through the idea of giving to the Mission a sort of referendum authority in strictly field matters. The exercise of this, however is confined to cases of practical field unanimity. And only when the matter is considered so important as to be necessary.

B. Request of 1917. — At the 1917 Annual Meeting of the Mission this proposal was taken from the table and the following substituted and passed: "That we request the Board to secure a revision of the Manual so as to secure that:

"Missions as ordinarily organized in foreign lands shall be the agents of the General Assembly for the propagation of the Gospel and the planting of the Church; the Mission to have the direction of the Assembly's work within its bounds; and by the power of review and control to be subject to its Board or other authorized agent. The Missions are also to have the right to appoint Commissioners to the General Assembly."

This approaches the problem by direct and comprehensive definition. The field organization is given a defined place in the Church's foreign operations, something which it has not heretofore had. In field matters it has exclusive original jurisdiction, and when its actions are within the scope and in accord with such regulations as from time to time may be established from above, this also becomes final. At the same time, the Home Base is given plenary restraining powers; and may also make initial proposals to the Mission in field matters, as is a recognized form of procedure in the Church. The most important point is that with relations thus defined, in new undertakings or new policies the Mission cannot proceed without the consent of the Board, neither can the Board initiate such on the field except through the concurrence of the Mission. In the ecclesiastical body supreme over both the two meet on a parity of representation.

This would seem to be in complete accord with the report mentioned above of the Committee on Principles and Methods of Administration in the 1917 Conference of the Foreign Mission Boards of North America. The subject of the report is "Cooperation from the Home Base in Missionary Administration on the Foreign Field." It says:

"The very wording of the topic announced presupposes, first, that the administration of missionary work is recognized as legitimately centering largely in the foreign field; and secondly, that a legitimate and vital part of that administration should emanate from the Home Base.

"To remove any remaining anxiety in the discussion of the topic, two observations may be made.

(a) The cooperation and supervision proposed relate only to larger questions of policy. It is recognized that the routine administration of missionary work belongs properly to the foreign field.

* * * * *

(b) A second reassurance may be found in the fact that the cooperation and supervision proposed to be extended from the Home Base to the foreign field will be advisory, suggestive and persuasive, rather than mandatory."

C. Proposal of Certain Furloughed Missionaries in Conference with the Board. — The following suggestion, first made by Missionaries of the Korea Mission on furlough, in conference with the Board on the action given above of the 1917 Annual Meeting, has since been unanimously endorsed by the Executive Committee of the Mission as being acceptable and expressing in another and perhaps simpler way the central thought of the Mission in its action at the Annual Meeting of 1917. The Board's Manual authorized by the General Assembly, in Section 40, deals with the powers of the Mission in relation to its work and subsidiary bodies, but it has been authoritatively stated at various times that it does not define the Board-Mission relations. It is proposed to amend this to read as follows:

"The Mission has general care and supervision of all work with its limits. It cannot inaugurate or conduct work, or inaugurate policies without the consent of the Board, and the Board does not do so in the field without the concurrence of the Mission. All questions of policy, expenditure and method are

subject to its judgment, and all requests requiring the action of the Board should be accompanied by the action of the Mission upon them. * * * * *

(The underlined sentence is the inserted amendment.)

In many ways this is not so clearly comprehensive and definitive as the action of the Annual Meeting of 1917, and so far as this is true there still remain possibilities of confusion. It has this merit, however, that it explicitly places the power of initiative in the hands of each of the two bodies, and limits the exercise of it in operation by the required concurrence of the other.

Conclusion

While clear definition on other points is desirable, this is the central thought of the Korea Mission, and was such in the action of the Annual Meeting. The Home Base has a general knowledge and therefore sources of wisdom which the Mission does not possess. Therefore the system should be such that the Mission may not push ahead solely on its own judgment. Likewise the Mission has particular knowledge and therefore sources of wisdom concerning its own work which the Home Base does not possess. Therefore the system should be such that the Home Base may not push ahead solely on its own judgment. When differences arise concerning new projects far better to wait at the posts of her doors until concurrence makes known the voice of Wisdom. Whether this would be admissible for all Missions or only for the larger ones I do not pretend to say. The General Assembly of 1917 took action to the effect that:

"The Assembly notes with especial interest the Board's policy of securing more efficient local administration in the various mission fields, including the largest amount of democratic self-government in the Missions, and recommends that whenever conditions permit, or render it advantageous in the judgment of the Board, further steps be taken in the same direction, especially in the case of the larger Missions."

In view of this recommendation we cannot but believe that a reasonable proposition to this end will meet with the approval of the Assembly and the Home Church.

We trust that this brief on the matter will be viewed in the assurance that its writer seeks only the interests of the Kingdom and increased efficiency in the common service which we render to the King. And we earnestly petition that consideration be given it and such an adjustment of the present system be devised and brought to the next General Assembly as will be satisfactory to both Home and Field and conserve the proper interests of both.

James E. Adams

Corresponding Secretary and Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Korea (Chosen) Mission.

The above brief was endorsed by the Executive Committee of the Korea Mission at its meeting of November 17-20, 1917.

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp.101- 106.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

Topeka, Kansas

November 20, 1918

William N. Blair

Dear Dr. Moffett:

I hope this letter will reach you in good time so you can give everybody in Pyengyang our love and greetings at the Christmas Eve supper. We are all quite well, and enjoying our furlough very much. It has been great to be here these exciting days when the great victory in Europe was being won. I was in Newton, Kansas Sunday November 10th and spoke about five times and went to bed pretty tired - but when every whistle in town began to blow at 2:30 a.m. the next morning I tumbled into my clothes in a hurry and joined the crowd celebrating around big bonfires on main street. You never heard so much noise in your life. Everybody shouting, pistols and shotguns shooting, autos going full tilt backfiring, mills and railroad locomotive whistles shrieking in one wild chorus of joy. It was like that all over the United States. I visited three cities that day and found peace celebrations going full blast everywhere. I forgot to tell you that I followed the crowd into the auditorium at 3:30 a.m. at Newton and got hauled onto the platform and made a patriotic speech that early in the morning to a crowd ready to applaud everything.

The "Flu" [influenza] has been very bad all over America this fall. Churches were closed for more than a month in Kansas so I got more rest than I expected. I was scheduled to speak almost every day in October and had to cancel all appointments or rather the state Board of Health cancelled them for me. The churches are open again and I have just returned from two weeks of meetings in central Kansas. Next Sunday I go to Camp Funston and speak to the soldiers and then to Illinois for two weeks of meetings, including a Sunday at Rock Island where I will speak at Broadway Church, reporting on Miss Cleland's 1½ years in Korea. December 29 to January 12th I am to speak every evening in special evangelistic services in my home church at Salina. You will understand how hard this will be for me. I would never have thought of attempting such a thing; but the pastor and session have asked me to lead these meetings and I haven't felt that I could refuse, trusting that special strength will be given. I wish you and others in Pyeng Yang would pray for me in connection with these meetings. After the Salina meetings are over I am planning to go to New York and study for a month in White's Bible School and later Mrs. Blair will join me in Chicago for a few weeks Bible study at Moody's Institute.

We are all so comfortable this evening. Edgar and Edith Emma are in bed, asleep I hope, upstairs. Grandpa and Grandma Allen are reading near the fire. Lois and Katherine are studying high school lessons for tomorrow and I am afraid Edith is reading a novel. Well, don't blame her, she and I did a two weeks washing today so she has a right to loaf tonight if she wants to.

With love and Christmas greetings from all of us to you all -

Yours as ever,
William N. Blair

P.S. Were you able to buy the Liberty Bonds for me? Will you please give Kimsie our old amah and Song-subang, our outside man, and Pyunsik two yen each for Christmas for me? I don't know whether you have any balance on hand for me or not, but if not I am sure you will carry me for this amount till money comes in or I can repay you.

W.N.B.

[someone wrote *Armistice Day* on the letter after it was received. That would be World War I.]

(from the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers)